a quarterly on Jainology

JAIN BHAWAN
CALCUTTA

VOL. VIII JANUARY 1974 NO. 3

Rupee One

All contributions, which must be type-written, and correspondence regarding contributions and book-reviews should be addressed to the Editor, Jain Journal, P-25 Kalakar Street, Calcutta-7.

For advertisement and subscription please write to the Secretary, Jain Bhawan, P-25 Kalakar Street, Calcutta-7. Subscription for one year : Rs. 3 00 ; for three years : Rs : 8.00. Foreign : $ 1.50 for one year.

Published by Moti Chand Bhura on behalf of Jain Bhawan from P-25 Kalakar Street and printed by him at The Technical & General Press, 17 Crooked Lane, Calcutta-1.

Editor : Ganesh Lalwani

Contents :

Plates :

Adinatha (1026-27 A.D.)
J. S. P. Mandir, Calcutta

Canakya—Was He a Jaina ?

MUNI MAHENDRA KUMAR 'PRATHAM'

[Canakya, also known as Kautilya, is a historic figure. It is widely believed that he was insulted by the ruling Nanda monarch of Magadha. To take revenge for this, he combined the astute intellect of a Brahmana with the military genius of Candragupta, perhaps a scion of the Nanda dynasty, and the two together brought about the fall of the Nandas. Later, when Candragupta Maurya ascended the throne at Magadha, it is but natural that he made Canakya his Prime Minister. But that is not the only reason why Canakya is remembered and revered to this day. Canakya lives on his own merit, through his great work, *Arthaśāstra*, a comprehensive treatise on science and art of Diplomacy. It is this that has earned him the exalted position of being the Machiavelli of ancient Indian polity.

The point at issue which has suddenly jumped into prominence in the historical forum of this country is if Canakya was a Jaina. So far, we have known that he was a Brahmana. But at the time of which we are talking there were many Brahmanas who were within the Jaina fold. It is an interesting fact that all the Ganadharas of Bhagavan Mahavira were Brahmanas. So if it is proved and established that Canakya was a Jaina, apart from being a Brahmana, then there is nothing to be surprised at it. It is almost a historical certainty that Canakya's master, Candragupta Maurya, was a Jaina and ended his life at Sravana Belgola in Mysore. Muni Mahendra Kumar 'Pratham' seeks to establish with the help of his gleanings from the Jaina Sources that Canakya was a Jaina by faith. His main points are that the house of Canakya's father has been called a *Sayyātara*, that Minister Canakya has been called a protector of the Sangha and that Canakya courted a fast unto death (*Imgini Maraṇa*) as prescribed by Jainism.—*Editor*]

Past lives on through human memory and then gets enshrined in treatises. Future delves deep into it and develops theories. In this process, truth lies hidden beneath the layers of the past and at a point of time, it reveals itself through the genious of man.

In the construction of Indian history, historians, both occidental and indigenous, have been charry to consult, still less to utilise, the Jaina sources. And yet, from the time of Bhagavan Mahavira upto-date, there have been many years, decades, and centuries which may be termed to be the golden periods of Jaina history. During these 2500 years, there have been thousands of influential Jaina Acaryas, monks and lay followers who have left their mark not only in the sphere of religion but also in those of politics, sociology and education, which in their turn, must have cast their impact on the course of Indian history But these sources have not yet been taken note of so that they lie hidden in the debries of the past. But as historical research progresses, one after another, these historical truisms are bound to come up and take their appropriate place, so that after many years and decades, history would come nearer to reality as it was in the past.

The present age expects the Jaina scholars to do creative work as also to carry on researches into the past. Let them advance in this direction by keeping their view-point free from bias. They are not to attempt to arrive at the desired goal by indulging in communalism and by twisting reality, nor are they to feel shy of presenting concrete proofs when they are available. To arrive at truth and to experience it is our goal and it is our sacred duty to proceed towards it.

It was during my sojourn at Jaipur in 1968-69 that I presented a paper entitled 'Historical Review of the Jaina Literature in Rajasthan' at the 3rd Conference of the Rajasthan Historical Congress. Incidentally, there was a mention in that paper about Emperor Candragupta being a Jaina. During the question hour, the assembled scholars made it the main theme of their interrogation. After a few days, a debate was arranged on Candragupta under the auspices of the Department of History of Rajasthan University. Winding up the debate, Dr. G. C. Pande, the Head of the Department, observed, "It would require a thorough study and research for three or four years to meet effectively the points made out by Muni Shri. Even then it is doubtful whether we would be successful."

Meanwhile my researches continued, and I came across proofs, that not only Candragupta but also his minister Canakya was a Jaina. This changed my own earlier view that while the master was a Jaina, not so the minister. Now I have ample material in my possession to establish that not only Candragupta Maurya and Canakya but also Candragupta Vikramaditya, the Satavahanas and many other monarchs of ancient Indian history were the followers of the Jaina path. As

these materials go out in course of time, I hope, they will give a new perspective to Indian history.

The earliest Jaina sources on the events of Canakya's life are two, viz., *Viśeṣāvaśyaka Vāṣya* and *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi*. The material contained in the former is inadequate. *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī*, in contrast, gives a bigger account from which we know that Canakya, apart from being a Jaina by birth, was well-versed in Jaina scriptures and was an extremely contented Sravaka[1]. The account is as follows :

In Gol region, there was a village called Canaka. A Brahmana named Cani used to live there. He was a devoted Sravaka[2]. Once, some Jaina monks stayed at his house. At that time, Cani was blessed with a son. It was a strange child. At the time of his birth, the child had a full set of teeth. Cani placed the child at the feet of the monks and enquired what type of future waited for a child born with teeth. The reply was that the child would one day be a king. Cani became thoughtful. To protect the kingdom, a king has to indulge in many a sinful act. Sinful acts lead to disaster from the spiritual point of view. Lest his son should come to grief, he chiselled out the child's teeth. When Cani again enquired of the monks, he was told that the child would be a king without royal insignia.

The boy was named Canakya. When he grew to early youth, he started learning the fourteen arts. He became well-versed also in philosophy. He became a Sravaka and started leading a very contented life.

In this treatise, there is an elaborate description of the insult of Canakya's wife at her father's house, his journey to the court of Nanda king, his insult by a maid-servant, Canakya's oath to uproot the Nanda dynasty, Candragupta's coming to power, friendship with king Parvata, war with Nanda king, downfall of the Nanda dynasty, marriage of Nanda king's daughter with Candragupta, etc. In each incident, there is distinct evidence of the far-sighted diplomacy of Canakya.

The sojourn[3] of Jaina monks at the house of Canakya's father supports the theory of Cani being a devout Jaina Sravaka. The abode of a householder, where Jaina monks stay, is called *Sayyātara*. The distinction of *Sayyātara* is available only to a rare or prominent Sravaka. Cani being the most prominent Sravaka in his village it was but natural for Canakya to be imbibed with Jaina ideals.

Āvaśyaka Malayagiri Vṛtti lends supports to the proofs given in *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* There is identity of incidents. Further it has been said that Cani was a Sravaka well-versed in the nine fundamental substances like *Jīva, Ajīva,* etc.[4] and that Canakya was well-versed in the fourteen arts, had profound knowledge of scriptures and was a fully contented Sravaka[5].

In *Upadeśapada*, Acarya Haribhadra Suri has written that Cani was a Sravaka[6] and that monks who were capable to interpret abnormal limbs in human beings came to his house. Besides recording the story of chiselling out of the teeth of Canakya, the Acarya has expressed his own views as follows : "On entering into boyhood, he became devoted to his studies. He became a Sravaka and developed non-attachment to worldly objects. He was highly contented and happy. He was always keen to avoid cruel and objectionable deeds[7]."

Acarya Haribhadra Suri has made the story of *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī* full and complete. *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī* deals only with the ascension of Candragupta as an Emperor and the successful diplomatic incidents of the administration under the guidance of Canakya. The author is silent about the manifold activities of Canakya's life except for incidents of boyhood. Acarya Haribhadra Suri has made up this deficiency. He has covered all aspects of Canakya's life and has thereby unfolded many facts hitherto unknown

So goes the story that during the time of Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya[8], there was a terrible famine. Monks found it difficult to procure food. Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya was old and hence unable to travel to a distant place. But he sent his disciples to a sea-side region where there was no famine. Two young monks, however, came back out of regard for their preceptor. At one time Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya was revealing to a would-be Acarya the secrets of '*mantra tantra*'. These two young monks sitting at a distance also secretly practised them. Meanwhile, famine set in and whatever food could be procured was first given by Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya to the young monks. He would take whatever was left over. His body became emaciated for want of sufficient nourishment. The young monks became worried. They found out another way of procuring food. By the power of '*mantras*', they reached the palace of Candragupta and secretly took away the food laid out for the king. The monks satisfied their hunger but now Emperor Candragupta went without sufficient food. Hunger made his body weak day by day. One day when Canakya enquired of Candragupta, the latter stated that the food laid out for him was being removed by somebody, and due to hunger, he was growing weak.

Canakya managed the situation intelligently. He unearthed the trick of the monks. In order to acquaint Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya with it, Canakya one day went to his resort and charged the monks with theft. In protest, Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya said : "When you are a protector of the Sangha, if the monks are compelled by hunger to deviate from their chosen path, the fault is entirely yours, nobody elses[9]."

With folded hands, Canakya fell at the feet of the Acarya, admitted his guilt and said : "Excuse me. Henceforth I shall take care of all the worries of the Sangha[10]."

While elaborating the story, Acarya Haribhadra has dwelt on in an interesting way on the last days of Canakya. On a false charge of murder of the queen-mother, sycophants and back-biters turned the mind of king Bindusara (Asoka's father) against Canakya. Canakya had grown very old by then. It was against his nature to live a neglected and disgraced life. So he begged pardon of all his relations and went to Gokula on the border of a forest to live there. There he began the *Imgini Maraṇa* (fast unto death at a determined place)[11]. King Bidusara repented very much when he came to know from his foster-mother the real facts about Canakya. He went to Gokula to bring back Canakya to his capital and reinstate him. But Canakya said, "Having given up all worldly attachments, I have started fast unto death[12]. What interest do I now have in thy kingdom ?" Although Canakya knew all the details of the evil designs of minister Subandhu against him, he did not say anything about it to King Bindusara[13].

The disappointed king returned to the palace. He was mentally distressed. Minister Subandhu thought that the king was getting more attracted towards Canakya. He became apprehensive of his plot being unearthed. Taking advantage of the situation, he approached the king with the request that he might be permitted to appease the Prime Minister and bring him back to the capital. King Bindusara at once granted the request. Subandhu honoured Canakya with offerings of incense and scattered it on the cow-dung cakes all around him. The cakes with incense caught fire and roasted the body of Canakya.

Acarya Haribhadra Suri has given a heart-touching account of his final moments. The Acarya has written : "Canakya had a pure soul at that moment. He was engrossed in religious contemplation. The body was immobile. Although in flames, he was full of piety and was completely engrossed in religious sentiments." These were the

thoughts in his mind : "Blessed are those who have become emancipated. They do not harm any living being. Persons like me engaged in worldly activities waste their time in impious deeds. Although I knew the gospel of the Lord, I remained chained to ignorance and delusion. Hence I engaged myself in deeds, harmful to my life, both present and future. How did I pass my time ? If in this life and in past lives, I have caused affliction to any beings, I seek to be forgiven by them. I forgive them myself. In the administration of the empire, whatever bonds have I acquired by my sinful acts, I give them up with three *karaṇas* and three *yogas*."

As the fire consumed Canakya's body, his cruel deeds were also being burnt up. Engrossed in *Parameṣṭhī Pañcaka* with pure thoughts, unattached and unperturbed, he embraced death. In heaven, he attained godhood[14].

Bhatta Paiṇṇā[15], *Santhāraga Paiṇṇā*[16] and *Maraṇa Vihi Paiṇṇā*[17] strongly support the fact of the incident referred to above. There are to be found in them detailed accounts of the incidents like Canakya becoming unattached and going to Gokula, his fast unto death, and his body being reduced to ashes by minister Subandhu (Subuddhi).

Acarya Harisena has elaborately dealt with the life story of Canakya in narrative number 143 of *Vṛhat Kathākoṣa*. According to Acarya Harisena, Canakya, in the last days of his life became initiated into the Jaina monastic order[18], and along with five hundred other monks, engaged himself in pure contemplation, and left the mortal body by a penance holding it immobile and fasting unto death[19]. It is stated in *Vṛhat Kathākoṣa* as follows :

"After defeating Nanda king, Candragupta and Canakya captured the kingdom of Pataliputra. After carrying on the administration for a long time, Canakya gave up all attachments. After listening to the tenets of Jainism, he gave up all earthly possessions and became a monk towards the close of his life. Once, wandering with the group of five hundred monks in the south, he arrived at a forest. He stayed in Gokula, steadfast in contemplation. Krauncapura was to the east of Gokula. King Sumitra reigned there. He was pleased when he heard about the arrival of Muni Canakya in Gokula and went to the latter to offer his obeisance. After he had returned Muni Canakya embarked on the *Pādopagamana* fast unto death. Subandhu, former minister of Nanda kings, who also went with King Sumitra, collected cow-dung cakes around Canakya and set fire to them. Accidentally,

Subandhu was also engulfed in the flames and thus met with his end. Canakya and the five hundred monks, while engaged in pure contemplation and bearing the afflication, also died."

Acarya Hemacandra, in the 8th Canto of *Pariśiṣṭa Parvan*, has thrown considerable light on the lives of Canakya and Candragupta[20]. It appears that what is stated in the *Pariśiṣṭa Parvan* is based on Acarya Haribhadra Suri's *Upadeśapada*. The only difference is that *Upadeśapada* is written in Prakrit dialect in a concise form, while *Pariśiṣṭa Parvan* is written in elegant Sanskrit in an elaborate style. Acarya Hemacandra, besides describing Canakya as Sravaka has also spoken of him as Sanghapurusa[21], Pravacanopahasabhiru[22], Nirjarodyata[23], etc. By describing the taking away of food from the dishes laid out for Candragupta as the food given in alms, the twelfth vow points to the need of entertaining guests. In this context, Canakya also insisted before the Acarya that he would feel honoured if from that day onwards, whatever food, water and other articles were required, were accepted from his house.

According to Acarya Hemacandra, Canakya played a prominent part in the conversion of Candragupta to Jainism. Canakya guided Candragupta not only in the political field but also acted as his spiritual adviser and saved him from heresy. Candragupta did not readily agree to a change of religion. Canakya put before him practical instances of true and false religion. When Candragupta was fully convinced, he gave up his former religion and embraced Jainism[24].

A Review :

Ancient treatises like *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī*, *Āvaśyaka Malayagiri Vṛtti*, *Upadeśapada*, *Bhatta Paiṇṇā*, *Santhāraga Paiṇṇā*, *Maraṇa Vihi Paiṇṇā*, *Bṛhat Kathākoṣa* and *Pariśiṣṭa Parvan* unanimously accept Canakya as Jaina.

While dealing with the life story of Canakya, only his wanderings as a monk, sacred thread, *kamaṇḍulu* and his being a Brahmana have been taken into consideration, but not the other incidents of his life. That may be the reason for the research and its findings so far having remained one-sided. Being a Brahmana, sacred thread, wanderings as a monk and the like are not opposed to Jaina culture.

When the Nanda dynasty came to power in Magadha, the first Nanda needed a capable Prime Minister. His attention was focused

on Kalpaka. Nanda urged Kalpaka to accept the exalted post, but being of a religious disposition, Kalpaka refused the offer and returned to his house. Nanda, however, did not give up his efforts. On acccount of an extra-ordinary incident, Kalpaka was however obliged to accept the post of Prime Minister. While dealing with his religious conviction, Acarya Haribhadra[25] and Acarya Hemacandra have proved that Kalpaka was a Jaina. Acarya Hemacandra has categorised him as a brother Sravaka[26]. Kalpaka's father was also a Jaina Sravaka[27].

In the Nanda dynasty, there were seven Nandas in succession. Kalpaka's family also produced many wise and able persons and all of them adorned the post of Prime Minister. During the regime of the seventh Nanda, Sakadala was the Prime Minister. While discharging the onerous duties of the Prime Minister, he followed the religious tradition of Kalpaka[28].

Canakya, although not born in the family of Kalpaka, kept the Sravaka tradition undiminished and successfully administered the empire with foresight.

According to the Jaina *Purāṇas*, wearing of sacred thread was first introduced in the age of Lord Rsabhadeva by the first Cakravarti (universal-monarch) Bharata[29]. At that time and thereafter, eminent Sravakas used to wear it. Even today many Jainas wear the sacred thread.

Although he was the Prime Minister, Canakya was a man of a contented disposition. Acarya Hemacandra, the author of *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī* and Acarya Haribhadra have referred to this contentment in him while implying the high qualities of Canakya as a Sravaka. This contentment was evident till the end of his life. In *Mudrā-Rākṣasa* drama, the contentment of Canakya, the Prime Minister, has been eulogised in the following terms :

upala sakala metad bhedakam gomayānām
vatubhirupadṛtānām barhiṣām stoma eṣa
śaraṇamapi samidbhih śuśyamāṇāmi rābhir-
vinamita paṭhalāntam dṛśyate jirṇam kudyam

(A small piece of stone for breaking the cow-dung cakes, grass plucked by students and the collected fire wood—these are all. And a cottage with a bent thatch and dilapidated walls.)

One argument advanced against Canakya being a Jaina is that in his *Arthaśāstra*, he has laid particular stress on *Varṇāśrama* system. In that context, some facts require examination. *Varṇāśrama* was the system for preservation of the social structure of that period. There have been changes and improvements in that system to suit the ages. Canakya considered it to be a useful system for his time. Other social reformers also adopted it from time to time. According to the Jainas also, this system originated during the time of Lord Rsabhadeva. Changes and improvements were made in it according to the needs of the time.

Another argument advanced is that Canakya had *śikhā* (the top knot on the head). The practice of keeping *śikhā* is not generally prevalent in the Jaina society today. But we have to look into the ancient customs. When the first Tırthankara Rsabhadeva was plucking his hair for initiation, he did not, on the prayer of Indra, plucked the *śikhā* and it adorned his head till the end of his life. Numerous ancient idols bear testimony to it.

Canakya is a celebrity in the field of diplomacy. Deceit, treachery and the like are the concomitants of diplomacy. Some scholar are not willing to regard Canakya as a Jaina for this reason. How could one, who has taken the vows of non-violence, freely adopt diplomacy ? How could one who practises diplomacy, be a Jaina ? May we ask— Does Vedic religion permit diplomacy and all that goes with it ? Deceit and treachery are not permitted by any religion. Mighty kings, generals, prime ministers, etc., of the past were followers of one religion or the other, whether Jaina, Buddhist or Vedic. They fought fierce battles and led attacks and counter-attacks. Still nothing is said when they were Hindus or Buddhists. Under the circumstances, how could the diplomacy of Canakya stand in the way of his being a Jaina ?

In history, whenever a new ring is added to the chain, as it were, of Jaina ideology, some scholars try to give it a twist by offering various arguments and play hide and seek with it. They prefer to keep their minds closed. But history continues to change sides. Every scholar adds something new to the existing stock of knowledge on the basis of his own impartial research. Books are available in plenty everywhere. When the hidden pages of history are examined, new facts become menifest. This can be done by any scholar, Jaina or non-Jaina. It will not be reasonable to accept a part of the new discovery and reject the other part ? Communal attachments should be discarded everywhere. No communal mask should be put on any historical truth.

Jaina literature has so far been lying buried in mss from in *Bhāṇḍāras* because of which very little study of this literature was possible. These mss are now becoming available. Hence new facts are coming to light. It might be said that historical facts are coming out with clarity and on solid ground. What is needed is that scholars understand this reality and show interest in it and then give proper orientation to history.

References :

[1] *umukka bāla bhāveṇa coddasa vijjāṭhāṇāṇi āgamiyāṇi so vi sāvao saṁtuṭṭho*, p. 563.

[2] *cāṇakke gollavisae caṇiaggāmo tatha caṇio māhaṇo so ya sāvao*, p. 563.

[3] *tassa ghare sāhū thiyā, Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī*, p. 531 ;
nīsesa purisalakkhaṇa viyāṇagā sūriṇo ghare tassa
kahavi vihāravasāo ṭhiyā sūo tathya samjakao, Upadeśapada, p. 109.

[4] *tatha caṇito māhaṇo so avagaya jīvājīva uvaladdha puṇṇa pāvāsava saṁbara nijjarāhigaraṇa bandhappamokkha kusalo*, p. 531.

[5] *umukka bālabhāveṇa coddasavi vijjāṭhāṇāṇi āgamiyāṇi sotha sāvago samtuṭṭho*, p. 531.

[6] *nāmeṇa caṇī tatthāvi māhaṇo sāvago so ya*, p. 109.

[7] *paḍhiyāṇi sāvagataṁ padivanno bhāvao nivinno*
aṇurūvā aibhaddaya māhaṇavasuṁggayā teṇa
pariṇīyā egā kannagā ya samtuṭṭha māṇaso dhaṇiyaṁ
ciṭṭhai nitthura sāvajjakajja parivajjaṇujjuto, p. 109.

[8] He is different from Acarya Sambhuta Vijaya who came after the 13th Acarya Yasobhadra and who preceded Acarya Bhadrabahu. Acarya Hemacandra in the *Pariśiṣṭa Parvan* has referred to Acarya Susthita in this context. There it has been said : *ācāryah susthito nāma candraguptapurevvasat.*

[9] *jāta guruṇā bhaṇio tai sāsaṇapālage saṁte*
e e chuhāparaddhā niddhammā houmerisāyārā
jām jāyā so savvo tavāvarāho na annassa, p. 113

[10] *laggo pāesu imo khāmaha avarāhamegameyame*
etto pabhii savvā cintā me pavayaṇassāvi, p. 113.

[11] *khāmittā sayaṇajaṇam jiṇimdadhamme nijo jiuṇam ca*
raṇṇo goulathāṇe imgiṇimaraṇam pavanno so, p. 113.

[12] *parivannāṇasaṇo ham vimukkasaṅgo ya vaṭṭāmi*, p 114.

[13] *na ya nāuṇa vi siṭṭham subandhuduvivalasiyam tayā ranno*
cāṇakkeṇa pesunnakaḍu vivāgam muṇaṁteṇa, p. 114.

[14] *Upadeśapada*, *gāthā* 163-72, p. 114.

[15] *guṭṭhe pāovagao subandhuṇā gomae paliviammi*
ujjhanto cāṇakko padivanno uttamam aṭṭham, Bhhatta Paiṇṇā, gāthā 162.

[16] *pāḍali puttammi pure cāṇakko nāma vissuo āsi savvārambhaniatto. imgiṇī maraṇam aha nivanno aṇuloma puaṇāe aha. sā sattumjao ḍahai deham sovi taha ḍajjhamāṇo paḍivanno uttamam aṭṭham guṭṭhe paovagao subandhuṇā gomae paliviyammi dajjhanto cāṇakko padivanno uttamaṁ aṭṭham, Samthāraga Paiṇṇā, gāthā,* 73-75.

[17] *pariṇīatāeṁ koī aggi se savvatye padejjāhi pādovagae sanne jaha cāṇakkassa ya karīse, Maraṇa Vihi Paiṇṇā, gāthā,* 569.

[18] *kṛtvā rājyam cirakālaṁ abhiṣicyātra taṁ naraṁ śrutvā jinoditaṁ dharma, hitvā sarva parigrahaṁ matipradhāna sādhvante mahāvairāgyasamyutah dikṣām jagrāha cāṇakyo jineśvara niveditām*

[19] *cāṇakyākhyo munistatra śiṣya pañcaśataih saha pādopagamanam kṛtvā śukla dhyānamupeyivān*

[20] Canto viii.

[21] Canto viii, *śloka* 411.

[22] Canto viii, *śloka* 405.

[23] Canto viii, *śloka*, 458.

[24] *utpanna pratyayah sādhūn gurun menetha pārthivah pāṣaṇḍiṣu viraktobhuddhiṣayeṣviva yogavit,* Canto viii, *śloka* 435.

[25] *Upadeśapada,* pp. 73-77.

[26] *sagarbhaśrāvakatvena sadā santosadhārakah na parigraha bhūyastvamanoratham pi vyadhāt Pariśiṣṭa Parvan,* Canto vii, *śloka* 21.

[27] *Ibid, ślokas* 13, 14, 18.

[28] *Ibid,* Canto viii.

[29] *Bharat Mukti—ek Adhyayan,* by the author, p. 65-66.

The Jaina Contribution to Indian Political Thought

B. A. SALETORE

[from the previous issue]

The Jaina *Sūtras* also enlighten us on the names of universal monarchs whose ideal was Bharata, the son of Rsabhadeva. About Bharata it is said that after learning the pure creed of the Jaina faith, "which is adorned by truth and righteousness", he gave up Bharatavarsa and all pleasures and entered the order. The pure faith is described thus : "A wise man believes in the existence of the soul ; he avoids the heresy of the non-existence of the soul ; possessing true faith one should practise the very difficult law, according to the faith." Next to Bharata (King of Ayodhya) it was Sagara (also the King of Ayodhya) who likewise gave up the ocean-girt Bharatavarsa and his unrivalled kingly power, and reached perfection through compassion Then came Maghavan (King of Sravasti) who was also a universal monarch of great power, and who gave up Bharatavarsa before taking to the life of a pure faith Next came Sanatkumara (King of Hastinapura), another Cakravartin, who abdicated in the favour of his son, and then practised austerities. Santi, the next universal monarch, followed suit. King Kunthu, the bull of the Iksvaku race, likewise gave up his universal dominion in order to become an ascetic. Then came Ara, who similarly gave up the sea-girt Bharatavarsa before becoming perfect. Mahapadma (King of Hastinapura) gave up his large kingdom, his army, war chariots, and his exquisite pleasures before becoming perfect. He was followed by Harisena (King of Kampilya), Jaya, Dasarnabhadra (King of Dasarna), Karakandu of Kalinga, Dvimukha of Pancala, Nami of Videha, Naggati or Nagnajit of Gandhara, Udayana of Sauvira, Nandana of Kasi, Vijaya, the son of Brahmaraja of Dvaravati and Mahabala of Hastinapura.[37]

Two points are clear from the above list of universal monarchs as given in the Jaina *Sūtras* : First, that the Jainas had a concept of universal dominion ; and secondly all the monarchs after realizing the pleasures of the world, became ascetics in the true sense of the term.

[37] *Jaina Sutras*, XVIII, 33-51, p. 85, 88, for the identification of Kings, p. 85 note (1).

The Jaina *Sūtras* are also important from another point of view. They refer to occasional periods of anarchy in kingdoms which were unsafe for Jaina monks to visit. In such countries they were liable to be suspected as spies. The six different forms of governments in this connection are the following : *arāyāṇi vā gaṇarāyāṇi vā yuvarāyāṇi vā do rājjāṇi vā verājjāṇi vā viruddharājjāṇi vā.*[38] That is, those states of the *arājatā* form, those ruled over by the *gaṇas*, those ruled over by two *yuvarājas*, those by two kings, those called the *vairājyas* and those styled *viruddharājyas.*

Excepting as regards the *Gaṇa* States, there is hardly any agreement among scholars as to what exactly the other kinds of States were as mentioned in the above list. The first type of the State was evidently one in which there was perpetual misrule. The word *gaṇa* was evidently used in the Jaina *Sūtras* in the sense of a republic ; and it is, therefore, not improbable that we have to refer the term *gaṇa-rājya* to a republican constitution of some sort about which no exact information is available in the Jaina literature. The term *gaṇa* was used by Panini in the sense also of a *saṅgha* in which there seem to have been two parties, as indicated by the term *dvanda*, and an executive, as suggested by the term *varga* composed of either five or ten, or twenty members.[39] But more than this it is not possible to say about the *gaṇas* concerning which there is some indefiniteness among the scholars. For instance, the late Professor A. S. Altekar, while commenting on the same passage in the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra*, wrote that *gaṇa* meant a democratic government, and that "it had a definite constitutional meaning and denoted a form of government, where the power was vested not in one person, but in a *gaṇa* or group of people".[40] This explanation is not helpful, since a group of people could agree to work together without forming themselves into a republican form of government. Villagers in India, as is well-known, have always worked in groups of their own. But that does not mean that we could consider the village communities as republican types of government.

An equally inadequate definition was given by late Professor Beni Prasad, who wrote of *gaṇa* or republican oligarchies.[41] A more elaborate explanation of the term *gaṇa* was given by the late Dr. K. P. Jayaswal, who maintained that the *Gaṇa* State was a Republican State ruled by

[38] *Acaranga Sutra*, II, 3.1.10.

[39] Panini, *Astadhyayi*, V, 1.60 ; Agarwala, V. S., *India as known to Panini*, pp. 428-434 (Lucknow, 1953).

[40] Altekar, A. S., *The State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 70 (Varanasi, 1949).

[41] Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

numbers, that it was another term for *saṅgha*, that the counting of votes took place in a *Gaṇa* State, that it had its own *mukhyas* or chieftains, a court, an assembly-whip, and even a Parliament.[42] We may merely observe that this fine edifice of suppositions does not rest on historical facts.

Likewise an equally unconvincing explanation was given by that versatile scholar of the word *arājatā* or *arājaka* which in the Vedic and post-Vedic literature meant a state of anarchy.[43] Dr. Jayaswal construed *arājaka* in the sense of a "non-ruler" constitution, a sort of an idealistic form of government in which Law was the ruler, there being no man-ruler. The basis of the State was the mutual agreement or social contract of the citizens.[44] The least one could say about this fantastic interpretation is that, if the *arājatā* or *arājaka* State was really of the idyllic type described by the learned historian, one cannot understand why the Jaina *Sūtras* should have included it in the list of States which were forbidden to the Jaina monks.

The *Yuvarāja* State mentioned in the same list evidently referred to a State which was ruled over by two (rival) crown princes at one and the same time. But what one fails to understand is why the *Yuvarāja* States continued to remain in the *yuvarāja* stage without the *yuvarājas* not attaining the full status of two *rājās*. In the context of the Jaina work, we may presume that a *yuvarājya* was declared dangerous for a Jaina monk because it was obviously ruled, as stated above, by two rival *yuvarājas* who must have been led by their respective leaders and politicians, thereby drawing the land in a perpetual era of misrule.[45]

About the *Do rājjāṇi*, *Verājjāṇi*, and *Viruddharājjāṇi*, too, there is no agreement among scholars as to their exact meaning. Dr. Jayaswal has nothing special to say about the *Do rājjāṇi* excepting that it was a constitutional kingdom ; while about the *Verājjāṇi*, he says that it was a

[42] Jayaswal, K. P., *Hindu Political Theory*, pp. 22, 23, 101-103, etc. (Bangalore, 1955).

[43] *Taittariya Brahmana*, 1, 5.9.1 ; *Aitareya* Brahmana, 1, 14. 6. See also *Vedic Index*, II, p. 215 ; Aiyangar, Rangaswami, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, pp. 82,84 (Madras, 1935).

[44] Jayaswal, *ibid.*, p. 84.

[45] Dr. Jayaswal's statement that the *Yuvaraja* State referred "to a government like the one over which Kharavela presided before his coronation" and that it refers to an inter-regnum (Jayaswal, *op. cit.*, p. 84) merely escapes the issue. If it was merely a question of an inter-regnum did it necessarily mean a period of anarchy ? Why should it have been classed by Jainas along with the other kinds of States of the *Arajata* type ?

democratic republic in which the whole country was supposed to rule. While the *Viruddhrājjāni*, according to the same authority, was a State which was ruled over by parties.[46] These definitions do not improve matters. According to Professor Altekar, the *Do rājjāṇi* (or *Dvirājaka*) was a State where two kings ruled ; if they pulled in opposite directions, there was a fighting State (*Vairuddharājya*).[47] No authority is cited by the learned professor for these definitions.

We must leave the above six forms of government as given in the Jaina *Sūtras* at this stage, merely noting that, while the *Sūtras* certainly give the names of the different forms of government, they do not help us to understand their exact nature. This does not mean, however that we could agree to the view of Professor Beni Prasad that the *Sūtras* merely touch on government "in a rather left handed way".[48]

In marked contrast to Jinasena's idealism was the realism of Somadeva Suri. Like Jinasena, he too served under a ruler of the Deccan. But Somadeva's patron was in political status unlike the powerful Rastrakuta monarch whose preceptor was Jinasena. This difference in the status of the two royal patrons of the two Jaina authors may be borne in mind in our estimate of their contribution to the totality of Indian political thought. Somadeva Suri lived at the court of a ruler called Yasodhara, who was the feudatory of the great Rastrakuta monarch Krsna III. He wrote two works—one called *Nītivākyā-mṛtam* (The Nector of Political Maxims), and the other *Yaśastilaka*. His age is determined from the end of the latter work wherein it is stated that it was finished on the 13th of *Caitra* when 881 years of the *Saka* king had elapsed, the cyclic year being Siddhartin during the reign of Yasodhara, when the latter's suzerain was Krsnarajadeva.[49] Somadeva, therefore, lived in A.D. 959. From the two works mentioned above, and especially from the *Yaśastilaka*, we learn that Somadeva was an Acarya of the Devasangha. Incidentally, it may be noted here that as pointed out, by me elsewhere, the Devasangha was one of the four

[46] Jayaswal, *ibid*, pp. 84, 85. If the State called *Vairuddharajjani* was called by that name because, as Dr. Jayaswal assumes it was ruled over by parties, then, in what way was it different from the *Gana* State which on the evidence of Panini, as seen above, had two Parties ? Dr. Jayaswal's explanation is unconvincing.

[47] Altekar, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[48] Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

[49] Peterson, Professor, *Report on the Skt. Mss. for* 1883-1884, p. 48 ; Bhandarkar, R. G., *op. cit.*, p. 207, and note (2). The *Nitivakyamrtam* was first published in the Manik Candra Grantharatnamala 22, Vikrama Era 1979. It was also edited with an anonymous *Tika* by Pandit Pannalal Soni, Bombay, 1923.

Sanghas mentioned in Devasena's *Darśanasāra* (A.D. 933), the others being the Nandi, Sinha and Senasangha.[50] Somadeva, we may presume was a southerner, and probably one of the earliest to enter the Devasangha. He was a pupil of Namideva who was a pupil of Yasodeva. Somadeva was noted as a great dialectician, a poet of considerable merit, and a master of Jaina theology and tradition.[51] He wrote the *Nītivākyāmṛtam* in the *sūtra* form, but the *Yaśastilaka* in the *campū* style. Of these two works the *Nītivākyāmṛtam* contains a more comprehensive treatment of government and allied subjects than the *Yaśastilaka* which seems to be later work, since the *Yaśastilaka* is mentioned in the *Nītivākyāmṛtam*. Somadeva's style and diction are uncommonly excellent. He is supposed to have written three other works but only one of which called *Trivargamahendra-mātalisañjalpa* refers to politics. This work is a dialogue between Indra and his charioteer Matali on *dharma*, *artha*, and *kāma*.[52]

We may now analyse Somadeva's contribution to political theory. Unlike any previous Jaina writer, Somadeva like another Sukracarya deifies the State in the first *sūtra* of the *Nītivākyāmṛtam*, thus—*atha dharmārthaphalāya rājyāya namah*. Now, salutation to the State, the source of *dhrma* and *artha*. Somadeva thus anticipated by almost a millennium the Hegelian concept of the State's aim being the chief good of human existence.[53] The fact that, unlike any other Jaina author, he does not salute the Tirthankaras in his opening verses, and the equally significant fact that in the above work, although he mentions religion, yet allows the reader to interpret it as he will, suggest that Somadeva was more inclined to lay stress on the material rather than on the spiritual side of man's existence. In this, as in many other matters he followed Kautilya, who in his *Arthaśāstra* lays stress on *ānvīkṣakī* (Logic and reasoning) by giving it the place of honour among the four sciences, the next three being in order of importance, the triple *Vedas*, *vārtā* (agriculture, cattle breeding and trade) and *daṇḍanīti*.[54] Both Kautilya and Somadeva, therefore, considered knowledge to be essential for the

[50] Read Saletore, *Mediaeval Jainism*, pp. 233-234.
[51] Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 230, n. (1)
[52] Beni Prasad, *ibid.*, p. 242. For a good critique on the *Nitivakyamrtam*, read Dr. Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, pp. 8-10.
[53] Read *Nitivakyamrtam*, pp. 1-26. See also Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 230. The commentator Haribala on Somadeva's work states that Jaina author, instead of saluting the Tirthankaras, preferred to imitate Sukracarya, the author of the now lost *Qushnasa Arthasastra* which began with a salutation to the State thus : *namo'stu-rajyavrksaya sadgunyay-prasakhine* (Jayaswal, *op. cit.*, p. 10).
[54] Kautilya, *Arthasastra*, Bk. I, Ch. ii. 6, p.5. text, p.6.

well-being of the State. Indeed, according to Somadeva, knowledge is the prime requisite in worldly affairs. He even went to the extent of maintaining that anarchy was preferable to rule, by a king, who was uninstructed in the art of Government. A perverse king was worse than a calamity ; while a worthy king, who was the repository of all goodness and merit, was extolled by all men.[55] In this particular regard Somadeva had outstripped even Kautillya, who does not seem to prefer anarchy to rule of an unworthy king.

What was the end of the State ? To this question Somadeva would reply in Kautilyan manner that the prosperity of the subjects was the end of the State. But prosperity was impossible without protection which, in turn, could not be maintained without punishment. It is here that we see how Somadeva completely repudiated Jinasena's theory of protection as given above. In order to understand Somadeva's theory of punishment, we should follow him in his description of the king and of the latter's functions. The king was almost a God on earth, who bowed only to his ancestors and *gurus*. His prime duty was protection. Somadeva asks the pertinent question—How can he be a king who does not protect his subjects (*sa kim rājā yo na rakṣati prajāh*) ?[56] Protection surpasses all royal duties in importance and religious merit. Protection of the subjects is the king's sacrifice (*prajā pālanamhi rājño yajñah*) ; and when the king protects his people in just ways, the skies shower beneficiently all benefits (*nyāyatah paripālake rājñi prajānām kāmadughā diśah*).[57]

But protection was impossible without being strict in regard to sinners and criminals. They were obstacles in the way of the happiness of the people. No mercy was to be shown to them : they were to be just weeded out. The king could not condone crime : he had to repress it. If a king did not put down the wicked, he was on the road to perdition. This was to be done by wielding the *daṇḍa* or punishment which was to maintain the social order. Indeed, the king was to set himself, like the God of Death, the task of inflicting punishment, so that people did not transgress their prescribed limits, and so that they could attain the three ends of life. Punishment was to be meted by the king only for the protection of the subjects, and not for amassing wealth. In this direction Somadeva followed the *Smṛti* tradition.[58]

[55] Somadeva, *Nitivakyamrtam*, p. 26-56.
[56] Somadeva, *ibid.*, p. 17. Cf. Aiyangar, *op. cit.*, p. 108.
[57] Somadeva, *ibid.*, 66, 105.
[58] Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, p. 486.

On the important question of the ministers and the need for the king to consult them, Somadeva followed closely Kautilya. The ministers were to be men of character, free from sensual pleasure, reliable, and courageous, but they could never be foreigners. As regards deliberation, secrecy was to be maintained. The king was not to be satisfied with one minister but with many. Somadeva dwells on the problem of ministers also in his *Yaśastilaka*[59] The details given both in the *Nītivākyāmrtam* and *Yaśastilaka* about the ministers are far too many to be recounted here. They are, on the whole, in agreement with those given in Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*.[60]

Somadeva has something to say about the next important element of the State, the army The army officers were not to be consulted on matters of State policy, since they would be only ready to solve them through war Further, if they were to be placed in control of civil policy, they might grow proud and powerful.[61] The army was the main support of sovereignty. Of the many wings of the army, the elephants were the most important section. Unlike Kautilya, who relied on mercenary troops, Somadeva was of the opinion that hired troops were not of much use. Those soldiers put forth their best not because of prospective monetary gain (by way of a share in the loot or booty) but because of the honour expected from their royal master That is, Somadeva in the above as well as in his injuction that no foreigner was to be employed a minister, gave expression to the keen sense of patriotism and nationality which had animated the people in those ages. But he was careful in warning the king that the latter should be punctual in paying his forces. What was the use of a cloud if it did not bring forth rain in time '?[62]

While the army was certainly useful, diplomacy was not less important. Allies were to be secured in as many ways as possible. He merely follows Kautilya in the delineation of the foreign policy.[63]

Somadeva indentified the State with the king to such an extent that he maintained that the safety of the monarch was the safety of the State. He said that a people may be prosperous but if they have no

[59] *Yasastilaka*, III, pp. 367-374 ; Ghoshal, *ibid*, p. 468.
[60] Kautilya, *ibid.*, Bk. I, chs. VIII, IX, X, & XV, pp. 12-17, 26-29. On ministers read *Nitivakyamrtam*, pp 62-135
[61] *Somadeva, Nitivakyamrtam*, pp. 136-137.
[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 207-215.
[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 210-216, 324-344.

government, they would come to no good. He firmly believed in protecting the king from all kinds of temptations, including that of women whom he unduly condemned as being source of evil and a bundle of craft and hypocrisy. The young princes were to be respectful to their parents even in thought, otherwise they would fall into misery.[64]

On certain fundamental problems like taxation, Somadeva was unequivocal. He warns the State against over-taxation. Taxation was to be adjusted to the resources of the people. Expenditure was never to exceed income. He followed the ancient Hindu theory of one-sixth of the produce being levied as taxes, which was to be paid only in return for the protection given by the king. The king received not merely the sixth of the produce of land but also a corresponding portion of the increase of the spiritual merit of his people, as a result of protection. He expressed it thus : *parıpālako hi rājā sarveṣām dharmāṇām saṣtham āpnoti.*[65] It was clear that he had rejected the theory of guidance of Jinasena, and had fallen in line with the traditional theory of the ancient Indian writers about the rate and policy of taxation.

Somadeva's importance in the history of Indian political thought may be stated thus : Firstly, he re-enforced the *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya in a manner which no other writer, excepting Kamandaka had done, thereby showing that Kautilya's theories had definitely come to stay centuries after the times of that great Mauryan Prime-minister. Granting that, as has been shown by his commentator Haribala,[66] he followed closely Kautilya, yet it proves that there was complete agreement between the Brahmana Kautilya and the Jaina Somadeva in regard to the most vital question of the State. Secondly, we see here not so much as the repetition of ideas as the confirmation of the old ideas by a later writer, thereby proving the continuity in Indian political thought. Thirdly, Somadeva by departing from the idealistic stand of Jinasena, had shown the truly practical bent of mind which has always characterized the Jainas. Fourthly, Somadeva was in a sense modern, since he had eliminated all social privileges. Although he recognized caste and upheld the ancient Hindu view that people should follow their hereditary professions, and even looked upon the Brahmanas with some special regard, yet he maintained the equality of all before the law.[67]

[64] *Ibid.*, pp. 211-271.
[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 250-271. See also Aiyangar, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
[66] Haribala's commentary is printed in the Digambara Jaina Granthamala. See also Somadeva, *Nitivakyamrtam*, pp. 6-7 (Soni's ed. 1923); Aiyangar, *op. cit.*, p. 17 and note (31) ; Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 242.
[67] Beni Prasad, *ibid.*, pp. 241-242. Read also Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, pp. 476-489 for an elaborate account of Somadeva's theory.

In this he no doubt followed Kautilya, who had unmistakenably enunciated the policy of treating all subjects alike by the State.[68] Fifthly, Somadeva had gone a step further than Kautilya by idealizing the State. No Indian writer had even invoked the State in the manner Somadeva had done. This is all the more remarkable when we realize that his partron was a petty feudatory of a great monarch. But like Kautilya he wrote for all time and for the whole country. Like Machiavelli producing his celebrated *The Prince* under the auspices of a small ruller, Somadeva wrote his two works *Nītivākyāmṛtam* and *Yaśastilaka* under the patronage of an insignificant ruler, thereby demonstrating the fact that remarkable things were written and done not necessarily under the partonage of mighty monarchs but were also produced under the benevolent care of smaller men amidst comparatively humble surroundings. This leads us to the last point of importance concerning Somadeva which is involved in the previous one. By anticipating Hegel's idea of the State to some extent, Somadeva had not only assured for himself a place of respect among all political thinkers, but had vindicated the position of Indian political thought in the international field Somadeva's deification of the State and the practically negligible part which the individual played in his concept of the State forestalled in a measure the nineteenth century German political philosopher G.W.F. Hegel's concept of the State. Hegel in his work on *The Philosophy of Right* (1821) taught that the State was the real person, its will being the manifestation of perfect rationality. In his own way Somadeva, too, had stated the same idea, namely, that knowledge was the prime requisite in the affairs of the State, thereby emphasizing the importance of rationality. When Hegel maintained that "the State is the divine idea as it exists on earth", he seemed to express in modern terms Somadeva's dictum that the king is a great god, to whom all excepting the ancestors and the *gurus* had to bow And in the statement of Hegel that "all the worth which the living being possesses—all spiritual reality—he possesses only through the State", he had admirably conveyed the idea of Somadeva as expressed in the salutation to the State cited in an earlier context in this paper, namely, *atha dharmārtha phalāya rājyāya namah*. But Somadeva stopped with this ; while Hegel developed the philosophical theory of the State trancending the limits of his Jaina predecessor.[69] Nevertheless the tenth century Jaina political thinker, inspite of all his shortcomings,

[68] This point is fully brought out in my *Ancient Indian Political Thought and Institutions*.

[69] Read Hegel, G W.F., *The Philosophy of Right* (1821). Translated by S. W. Dyde. Read also Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

had earned for himself and his country a place of distinction among international thinkers who had deified the position of the State.

Two centuries later there appeared one of the greatest figures in the Indian literary world. This was Hemacandracarya, also called Hemacarya (A. D. 1089-1173). His royal patron was first the famous Siddharaja Jayasinhadeva (A. D. 1094-1143), the monarch of Gujarat and, then, the next ruler Kumarapaladeva (A. D. 1143-1174). In the days of king Siddharaja, Hemacandracarya had written a treatise on grammer called *Siddhahema* as well as other works like *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, Anekārthanāmamālā, Haimanāmamālā* or a string of names composed by Hema (candra) ; and had begun his great *Dvyāśrayakāvya,* which was intended to teach both grammer and the history of the Chaulukya or Solanki family to which king Siddharaja had belonged. But Hemacandracarya became more famous during the reign of the next monarch of Gujarat—Kumarapaladeva. Hemacandracarya's *guru* was the learned Bhattaraka, Devasuri, a Svetambara teacher.[70]

The life of Hemacandracarya is interwoven first with the career of Siddharajadeva and then of that of Kumarapaladeva.[71] It abounds in wonders with which we are not concerned here. In the reign of Kumarapaladeva he wrote many well-known Sanskrit and Prakrit works like *Adhyātmopaniṣad* or *Yogaśāstra* in twelve chapters and 12,000 verses ; *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra* or the lives of sixtythree Jaina saints of the *utsarpiṇī* and the *avasarpiṇi* ages ; the *Pariśiṣṭaparva* of 3500 verses being the life of Jaina *Sthaviras* who had flourished after Mahavira ; the Prakrit *Sabdānuśāsanam* or Prakrit grammer ; *Dvyāśrayakāvya,* which he begun in the previous reign of king Siddharaja; and which was a double dictionary being both a grammar and history, the *Chandānuśasana* of about 6,000 verses or prosody ; the *Liṅgānuśāsana* on genders ; the *Deśīnāmamālā* in Prakrit with a commentary, a work on local and provincial words ; *Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi* a work on rhetoric ; and finally, *Laghu-arhannīti* with which we are concerned here.[72]

Along with the *Laghu-Arhannīti* we have to study *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra,* the first book of which styled Adisvaracaritra, is of much interest to us. The great Hemacandra harked back to Jinasenacarya

[70] Indraji, Bhagawanlal, *History of Gujarat* (in the Bombay Gazetteers), pp. 156, 180, and *ibid.*, note (2), 191, 192.

[71] Indraji, *ibid.*, p. 182ff.

[72] Indraji, *op. cit.*, p. 193. The *Laghu-Arhanniti* does not figure in this list. On *Laghu-Arhanniti* see Beni Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 227 ; Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, pp. 456, 490.

to some extent but could not help following the earlier Hindu writers on polity in certain other important matters. In this account of the origin of society and the political order, Hemacandracarya treads in the foot-steps of Jinasenacarya. The Adisvaracaritra, for instance, is more of the pattern of the *Ādipurāṇa* inasmuch as it introduces the reader to the twelve spoked wheel of Time with its two great cycles called *avasarpinī* and *utsarpinī*. The *avasarpinī* cycle had six ages in a decending order, namely, pure Bliss, Bliss-Sorrow, Sorrow-Bliss, Sorrow, and pure Sorrow. The *utsarpiṇī* cycle had the same spokes but in a reverse order The succession of the six ages in the *avasarpiṇī* cycle was attended with a gradual decline in the longevity and health of men, in their food, and even in the *kalpabṛkṣas* or wish-giving trees. It was in the third age of the *avasarpinī* cycle that the hero Bimalavahana and his wife (both twins) were born in the southern part of the Bharatavarsa in the Jambudvipa, in the region between the Ganges and the Sindhu. Bimalavahana was the progenitor of a line of chiefs When in the course of time, the wish-giving trees diminished in potency, one of the twins born in the manner of their progenitors, wished to acquire a *kalpa-bṛkṣa* at which the other afflicted twins made Bimalavahana their king with ruling powers Then the latter divided the wish-giving trees among his followers, thereby originating the Institution of Property. He then instituted the penalty of '*hakār*' for punishing any one who crossed the boundry of a wish-giving tree with a view to securing the tree of another. Gradually with the further decline in morality, the fourth descendant from Bimalavahana instituted the penalty of '*makār*' ; the sixth introduced the penalty of '*dhikkār*'. In the days of the seventh patriarch called Nabhi, they made, at his advice, Rsabha their monarch, who introduced the institution of punishment in its civil and criminal aspects.[73]

Notwithstanding the above approach to the origin of society and of the political order in the manner of Jinasena, Hemacandracarya, we may note, was never carried away by mere idealism. It was not that he discarded the theory of Jinasena On the other hand, we see the influence of the *Ādipurāṇa* in the *Laghu-Arhannīti*. But Hemacandracarya was, on the whole, a more practical teacher than Jinasena. Indeed, it will be shown below that no Jaina thinker wielded such a powerful and perhaps everlasting influence on the contemporary government as Hemacandracarya did on that of Kumarapaladeva in the twelfth century.

[73] Hemacandra, *Trisastisalakapurusa Caritra*, Bk. 1, Adisvara Caritra, pp. 93-99, 148-155 (Trans. into English by Dr. Helen M. Johnson, Baroda, G.O.S., 1931). Text published earlier in Bhavnagar, 1906. See also Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, pp. 459-460.

Hemacandracarya drew freely on the earlier Hindu works on polity. He pays greater attention than any of his predecessors of the Jaina faith to civil and criminal law ; recomends the use of *sâma*, *dāna*, *bheda* and *daṇḍa*, much in the same way as a Hindu writer on Polity would have done ; and fearlessly enjoins that war should be carried on boldly, stating that the famous Jaina principle of non-violence to life and of the desctruction caused in war, would not deter him from recommending this measure.[74] That Hemacandracarya followed in some measure Kautilya is clear when we note what he stated about a conquered country. After the king had won a victory, he should grant amnesty to the followers of the conquered king, and after considering their wishes, install a scion of the old royal family as the next ruler, provided he was devoted to the conqueror. The new ruler as well as the conquered subjects should be gratified with rewards.[75] This may be compared with what Kautilya says in Chapter V, entitled Restoration of Peace in a conquered country in Book XIII, where he has given in detail the measures which the conquering king has to take in order to restore peace in the conquered land [76]

Much more than his work styled *Lagu-Arhannīti* was Hemacandracarya's great personal influence which marks him off from the rest of the eminent Jaina authors on Polity, as one who did the greatest good to the country When on the death of King Siddharaja-Jayasinhadeva, there was a period of inter-regnum in the history of Anhilvada, the capital of Gujarat, three names including that of Kumarapala were laid before the nobles of the Court who sat in council, to determine as to which of them was to be the king. It was then that Kumarapala was chosen and installed as the new king and that a new age in the history of Gujarat began—an age which was illumined as much by the munificence of Kumarapaladeva as by the sagacity, humility, and religious fervour of Hemcandracarya The latter became the guide and the *guru* of the new monarch.[77] It is impossible to describe within the limits of a small article the incalculable good which this great Jaina thinker did to Gujarat and to India. We can at best only summarize his main activities. It was Hemcandracarya who induced the king to forego the claim of the State to the property of those died issueless. It was under his influence that Kumârapaladeva gave up the use of flesh and wine, ceased to take

[74] Cf. Law, N. N., *Studies in Indian History & Culture*, pp. 260-261 (London, 1925).

[75] Hemacandra, *Laghu-Arhanniti*, II, pp. 66-68. (With a Gujarati commentary, Ahmedabad, 1906). See also Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, p. 492.

[76] Kautilya, *ibid.*, Bk. XIII, Ch. V, pp. 437-439; text, pp. 408-410.

[77] Read Indraji, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-194.

pleasure in the chase, and by beat of drum forbade throughout his vast kingdom the taking of life. Kumarapaladeva withdrew from hunters, fowlers, and even fishermen their licenses, and compelled them to adopt other avocations that were in agreement with the great principle of causing no harm to living beings. The king ordered that only filtered water was to be given to the animals employed in the royal army. When a Bani of Sambhar (which province in Rajputana had been conquered by Kumarapaladeva) had been caught killing a louse, he was brought in chains to Anahilavada. On another occasion a woman of Nador in Marwar had offered flesh to a field-god (*Kṣetrapāla*). At this her husband was put to death by Khelna, the chief of Nador in order to escape the wrath of the great king. What Asoka, the Buddhist, had failed to do, Kumarapaladeva, the Jaina, did *Ahimsā* was not only made the corner-stone of the edifice of the State but was made to cover the existence of even the fishes in the ocean. Asoka the Great had lived the life of a Buddhist almost in vain ; the sad condition of the Mauryan capital and the Empire soon after his death does not warrant the saying that he had succeded in planting firmly the tree of *ahimsā* for ever in the land. But Kumarapala, the illustrious, not only successfully lived the life of a devout Jaina but handed down to the country the glorious gospel of *ahimsā* which centuries afterwards another celebrated son of Gujarat was to hold aloft as the beacon light of India's Freedom The credit of thus converting a negative axiom of non-killing into a positive one of life and progress must go to the great Hemcandracarya whose vast learning was eclipsed by his more profound sense of the realism lying behind the principle of *ahimsā*.

Reprinted from *Acarya Bhiksu Commemoration Volume*.

[78] Indraji, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

Jaina Shrines At Varanga

P. GURURAJA BHATT

One of the five renowned centres of Jainism in Karnataka has been Varanga, a village in the Karkala taluk of South Kanara district. But the religious and historical significance of this place has been little known to the people until recently, when the discovery of a few epigraphs threw light on this centre of Jaina pilgrimage.

Varanga derives its name from a saint of that name and the spiritual antiquity of this place goes back at least *circa* 10th-11th century A.D. The entire village (then a city) was gifted to the saint by the Alupa king, Kundana, who ruled over the district. From early times, this region was under the spiritual control of the pontificate of Patti Pombucha (modern Humcha) in the Shimoga district. There is also a monastery there as a survival of the pontifical authority. The principal monuments are two : the Neminatha Basti and the Kere Basti. The latter is also known as the Caturmukha Basti, because it has faces in four directions.

The Neminatha Basti is one of the major monuments of the district, constructed entirely of hard granite. It is a duo-cellular structure with a *sanctum sanctorum*, a *sukhanasi* and a *navaranga* and adjoining the *navaranga*, a sub-structure to the south. The porch is in front. The columns are massive all round the structre and the roofing is covered with thick granite slab.

The structure is typically Vijayanagara in style and one make the mistake of thinking that the shrine came into existence only during the Vijayanagara period. The discovery of three Hoyasala inscriptions in this Basti unmistakably traces the origin of the shrine to the mid-Hoysala period, i.e., *circa* 12th century A.D. Two epigraphs are engraved on the pedestal of two beautiful and elegant bronzes of Adinatha and Anantanatha, 37½ cm. and 45 cm. high respectively. The main

image in the Basti is of Neminatha, which is a remarkable figure six feet in height seated in *padmāsana* on *padma pītha*. On the pedestal of this deity is engraved in Hoysala characters the inscription that one Nemi Setti son of Parsva Setti, disciple of Kirti Bhattaraka (who in turn was a disciple of Hemacandra Bhattaraka), caused the image to be carved and set up there.

The Kere Basti is situated in the middle of a tank about 10 acres in extent and is one of the few lake temples of the district This is a neat little structure facing four directions and having 4½ feet high Tirthankaras each facing in a different direction. The inscription on the pedestal of the images informs us of its installation in A.D. 1431. The sight of this lake temple against the hill background towards the east is enachanting.

A solid medieval structure of hard granite with a free-standing elegant pillar called '*māna-stambha*' a monastery with an extensive field of five acres in front, the lake temple and captivating scenery to the east, two tombs of Jaina saints--these comprise the antiquities of Varanga, a sequestered place conducive to contemplation.

A Sidelight on Social, Economic and Political Aspects of Civilization in its Beginning on the Basis of the Jaina Agamas

J. C. SIKDAR

"With the rise of the conception of the impropriety of sexual intercourse between the children it had an effect upon divisions of old and the foundation of new household communities"[1]. (Hausgemeinden)

Such a picture of the Family Community is found just after the period of Nabhi, the fourteenth *Kulakara*, at the dawn of civilization when his son Rsabhadeva became the tribal chieftain. As pointed out before, he married his co-uterine sister Sumangala and one Yaugalic girl Sunanda who was a part of the yugala and who lost the other part—male brother and had begot one hundred sons and two daughters on them. Since his time there took place the rise of the conception of the impropriety of sexual intercourse between children of a common mother as he prohibited the marriage between Bharata and Brahmi (the co-uterine brother and sister) and Bahubali and Sundari (the co-uterine brother and sister). It had an effect upon such divisions of old and the foundation of new household communities. The punaluan family arose out of yaugalic consanguine family, "as the one or more groups of sister became the nucleus of one household, while their natural brothers the nucleus of the other"[2]

With the advent of civilization, according to the Jaina *Āgamas*, a certain pairing took place under group marriage since the Age of Rsabhadeva for longer or shorter period, as most of the successive kings married many princesses at a time in group, e.g. 64000 princesses were married by Bharata at a time, although there was one *agramahiṣī* (chief queen) among them. That is to say, "the man had a principal wife among numerous wives and he was the principal husband among them"[3].

[1] F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 39.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

The impetus given by Rsabhadeva, the first tribal king to prevent marriage between co-uterine brothers and sisters drove nails to the system of pairing family during the Age of civilization. At this stage one man lived with one woman yet in such a manner that polygamy and infidelity remained the privileges of men for economic reasons, at the same time the strictest fidelity was demanded of the woman[4].

The pairing family was itself too weal and unstable to make an independent household necessary or even desirable as expected during the Age of civilization among the people of the stage of the infancy of the human race and the Age of Kulakarism than they did during the period of civilization. The division of labour between two sexes determined the status of women in society in that stage of civilization. The social status of the lady of civilization, surrounded by sham homage and estranged from all real work in civilization was infinitely lower than that of hard working woman[5] of the Age of Kulakarism.

With the undermining of primitive free life and the growth of population the more degrading and oppressive became the position of the women, the more fervently must they have desired for the right to chastity, to temporary or permanent with one man only as deliverence or to no-marriage and to joining Jaina Sangha as nun.

This advance during the Age of civilization had originated from the women, but not from the men for the reason that they had never dreamed of renouncing the pleasures of actual group marriage with so many girls.

The pairing family arose on the border line between Kulakarism and civilization in which monogamy became the family characteristic at a later stage.

Until the upper stage of Kulakarism fixed wealth consisted of the house, clothing, household utensils of the simplest kind, crude implements of procuring and preparing food, boats, weapons, etc. Food had to be procured anew every day. At the stage of civilization all

[4] King Bharata kept his 64000 queens (a fabulous figure) in a separate *mahal* (apartment) with strict vigilance for their fidelity. It is strange how the maintenance of such a large troupe of ladies could be made at the expense of the public exchequer for the sake of luxury and pleasure of a single monarch. It shows clearly the degraded position of women.

[5] Even to-day the hard working woman of the Santal tribe of India has better status in the social life than the ladies of the Indian feudal and capitalist classes.

the previous means of procuring food now became obsolete. The new wealth in the form of private property consisted of herds, artistic products, metal utensils, articles of luxury, etc., and finally human cattle—the *Sūdras.*

Slavery was invented by creating a class of people calling them *Sūdras* who were actually the prisoners of tribal war in the beginning at the mercy of the victorious tribal king. There was no slavery in the Age of Kulakarism, as it was useless in this stage.

F. Engels says, "The slave was useless to the barbarism of the lower stage. It was for this reason that the American Indians treated their vanquished foes quite differently from the way they were treated in the upper stage"[6].

At the stage of Kulakarism human labour did not yet yield any noticeable surplus over the cost of its maintenance, but this changed with the introduction of cattle breeding, of the working up of metals, of weaving and finally of field cultivation. *A similar picture of economic conditions is found at the stage of barbarism.*

After the conversion of the herds finally into family possessions the exchange value changed with the labour power. More people were required to tend the cattle as they rapidly increased. The *Sūdras* might have been useful for this job and further they could be treated like the cattle itself. At the stage of civilization the social custom allowed the man to be the owner of the new sources of food-stuffs—the cattle and later of the new instrument of labour—the *Sūdras.*

In the period of civilization the society became dynamic and the social conditions were changing fast with a sufficient motive for a direct interest, as innate human casuistry sought to change things by finding loopholes for breaking through tradition within tradition. The man seized the power in the house and the woman was degraded and enslaved as the object of his lust—a mere instrument for breeding children, for this lowered position of woman is especially found among the *Kṣatriyas-rājanyas* of the stage of civilization in their luxurious polygamy. The first effect of the sole rule of the men is found in the emergence of the patriarchal family. Polygamy became historical luxury product of civilization—a product of slavery and limited to a few exceptional cases. It was a privilege of the rich. Monogamy appears to have arisen out

[6] *The Origin of the Family, etc., p.* 55.

of the pairing family in the transition period from the stage of Kulaka-rism to the developing stage of civilization. It was a great historical advance as the subjection of one sex by the other and it inaugurated slavery and private wealth along with it at the same time.

F. Engels holds the view that "the heritage bequeathed to civilization by group marriage is double-sided, just as every thing engendered by civilization is double-sided, double-tongued, self-contradictory and antagonistic"[7].

For men group-marriage actually existed even to the days of the Tirthankaras What for a woman is a crime entailing dire legal and social consequences is regarded in the case of a man as being honourable. Such a picture of the position of woman is found during the period of civilization as depicted in the Jaina *Āgamas* in connection with the account of the life of Ti thankaras

Threshhold of Civilization

The stage of civilization was inaugurated by the progress in division of labour made by Rsabhadeva, as it is revealed in the division of the people into classes, such as, *kumbhakāra* (potter), *citrakāra* (designer or artist), *nantika* (weaver), *karmakāra* (artisan), barber, etc [8]

The civilization brought about by Rsabhadeva made a third division of labour by creating a class that did not take part in production but embarked in exchanging products, i e., the *Vaiśya* (mercantile class) for the first time. In course of time this class captured the management of production as a whole and economically subjugated the producers

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[8] *Avasyaka Curni*, Pt. 1, pp. 155-56, "*ekka manussajai rajjupattu do kaya usabhe i tinneva sippavanie savagadhammammi cattari*", *Acaranga Sutra*, Part 1, 19, p. 7 ; *yavannabheyo bhagavannadyapi rajalaksmimadhyaste, tavadekaiva manusyajatih tasyaiva rajyotpattau bhagavantamevasritya ye sthitaste ksatriyah, sesasca socanadrodanacca sudrah, punaragnyutpattavayaskuradisilpavanijyavrtya vesanadavaisyah bhagavato jnanotpattau bharatakakanitanchanaccharavaka eva brahmana jajnire je rayam assita te khattia jaya, anassia gihavaino jaya, jaya aggi uppanno taya pagabhavassita sippiya vaniyaga jaya, tehim tehim sippavanijjehim vittim visamtiti vaissa uppanna bhattarae pavvaie bharahe abhisitte savagadhamme uppanne bambhana jaya, nissita bambhana jaya, mahanatti ukkassagabhava dhammapia jam ca kimcivi hanamtam picchamti tam nivaremti ma hana bho ma hana, evam te janena sukamma nivatita banna bam hana jaya suddha samvutta*, *Acaranga-Niryukti*, p. 7. (Silanka).

to its rule, "a class that makes itself the indispensable intermediary between any two producers and exploits them both"[9].

"On the pretext of saving the producers the trouble and risk of exchange, of finding distant market for their products, and of thus becoming the most useful class in society, a class of parasites arises, genuine social sycophants, who, as a reward for very insignificant real services, skim the cream of production at home and abroad, rapidly amass enormous wealth and corresponding social influence, and for this very reason are destined to reap ever new honours and gain increasing control over production during the period of civilization, until they at least create a product of their own-periodic commercial crises"[10].

It will be seen later on that this mercantile class took away the reigns of leadership of Jaina Sangha from the hands of the ruling *Kṣatriya* caste and used the same to the advantage of class interest in various ways, posing itself as the champion of *Ahimṣa dharma* at present, leaving aside the great ideals of the *Kulakaras* and *Sramaṇa dharma.*

At this stage of civilization, when Rsabhadeva was king, the young mercantile class had no idea of the big things stored for it. But it took birth and shape and gradually made itself indispensable, that is why it is found in the *Āgamas* that a *Sārthavāha* (financial adviser) must he associated with the royal court of Ancient India. Even the Muslim rulers in India could not carry on their royal administration without the financial advice and assistance of this class, as they often needed money for the royal administration and luxury. With the invention of metallic money and minted coins this non-producer could rule the producer and his products.

Whoever possessed this money ruled the world of production. The cult of money made it plain that all commodities and hence all commodity-producers, all forms of wealth must grovel in the dust before this incarnation of wealth—Money. Its power revealed itself with primitive crudity and violence in the period of its youth.

In the process of the development of civilization there came the lending of money, entailing interest and usury, after the sale of commodities. Like the Jews of the Middle Age this mercantile class played the role of money lender. Besides wealth in commodities and money-wealth there came into existence wealth in the form of land since the

[9] *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 162.
[10] *Ibid.*

parcels of land became hereditary property by the titles of individuals to them, originally assigned by the *Kula* (tribe) to individuals. The full, free ownership of land implied both the possibilities of unrestricted and uncurtailed possession and of alienating it by shaking off the chains of the paramount title of the *Kula*, and tearing inseverable bond which tied him to the soil. The land now became a commodity which could be sold, pledged and mortagaged with the introduction of private ownership.

F. Engels presents a similar account of economic conditions of civilization in this manner : "Commercial expansion, money, usury, landed property and mortgage were thus accompanied by the rapid concentration and centralization of wealth in the hands of a small class, on the one hand, and by the increasing impoverishment of the masses and growing mass of paupers, on the other. The new aristocracy of wealth ... forced the nobility permanently into the background (in Athens, in Rome, among the Germans)"[11].

As a result of the social revolution the gentile constitution of the *Kulakaras* stood powerful in the face of new elements that had cropped up without its help at the stage of civilization under the leadership of Rsabhadeva. The sedentary state of Kulakarism was interrupted by the mobility and changes of abode upon which commerce, changes of occupation and the transfer of land were conditioned. Besides, the old wants and interests, new wants and interests had arisen from the revolution in the conditions of earning one's livelihood and the resulting change in social structure.

The interest of the groups of craftsmen created by division of labour and the special needs of the town as opposed to the country required new organs with the growth of population and conflicting interests of the *Kula* and the heterogenous population of town, as the *Kula* association confronted these masses as exclusive privileged bodies—a hateful aristocracy. A new society had grown out of a society devoid of international antagonisms and coercive power[12] except public opinion. It had to split up into free man and *Sūdras* (slaves), into exploiting rich and exploited poor by the force of all its economic conditions of existence. Thus the gentile constitution of the *Kulakaras* was burst asunder by the division of labour and consequently there took place the division of society into classes. The state stepped in its place as a result of the evolution of socio-economic life of the people.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[12] See the *digvijaya* of Bharata, his polity and administration in *Avasyaka Curni.*

Origin of State :

The state was built upon the ruins of the gentile constitution of the free people under the *Kulakara* order, as Rsabhadeva became the first tribal king. Similar instances are found in Greece (Athens), Rome and among the Germans. "Athens represented the purest, most classical form. Here the state sprang directly and mainly out of the class antagonism that developed within gentile society. In Rome gentile society became an exclusive aristocracy amidst a numerous plebs, standing outside of it, having no rights but only duties. The victory of the plebs burst the old gentile constitution asunder and erected on its ruins the state, in which both the gentile aristocracy and the plebs were soon wholly absorbed. Finally, among the German vanquishers of the Roman Empire, the state sprang up as a direct result of the conquest of large foreign territories, which the gentile constitution had no means of ruling"[13].

"The state is, therefore, by no means a power forced on society from without ; just as little is it the reality of the ethical idea, the image and reality of reason, as Hegel maintains"[14].

From the study of the evolution of mankind, beginning from the stage of infancy of the human race to the upper stage of the *Kulakara* society it appears to be clear that the state which came into being under the leadership of Rsabhadeva is a product of society at a certain state of development.

As pointed out before, with the change in Nature, the growth of population and the destruction of natural sources of food staff and socio-economic needs, the *Kulakara* society became entangled in an insoluble contradiction within itself, it had split into irreconcilable antagonisms followed by conflicting economic interests and lawlessness and anarchy. Therefore, it became necessary to have a power seemingly standing above society for alleviating the conflict and keeping it within the bounds of order. This power of the society of the Kulakaras was the state which came into being by placing itself above the society and alienating itself more and more from it in the course of history from the ancient period up to the modern age.

As already mentioned, Rsabhadeva made the political division of the country into provinces, provinces into divisions and districts,

[13] *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 166.
[14] *Ibid.*

district into towns and villages. That is to say, as distinct from the old gentile order of the *Kulakaras* the state under Rsabhadeva divides its subjects according to territory, as the people became mobile.

The establishment of a public power was the second distinguishing feature of the state organized by Rsabhadeva, as it was necessary because a self-acting armed force of the population became impossible since the split of the social order into classes or castes—*Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya* and *Sūdra*[15].

F. Engels explains that "this public power exists in every state ; it consists not merely of armed men but also material adjuncts, prisons and institutions of coercion of all kinds, of which gentile society knew nothing. It may be very insignificant, almost infinitesimal, in societies where class antagonisms are still undeveloped and in out of the way places, as was the case at certain times in certain regions in the United States of America"[16].

As observed before, there were three kinds of moral punishment in the Age of the *Kulakaras*, viz. *hakār* (expression of regret and disapproval), *makār* (prohibition) and *dhikkār* (reproach). *Dhigdaṇḍa* and *Vāgdaṇda* are also referred to in the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*[17]. Next Rsabhadeva brought into force the law of punishment by confinement to a particular region (*maṇdalabandha*) and institutions of coercion with the birth of the State in the beginning of civilization, while his son Bharata introduced *caraka* or imprisonment and *chaviccheya* or mutilation of hand, foot, nose, etc.[18].

The contributions from the citizens in the form of taxes became necessary to maintain this public power ; they were absolutely unknown in the *Kulakara* society[19]. "As civilization advances, these taxes become inadequate ; the state makes drafts on the future, contracts loans, public debts"[20].

Now the officials or the Government as the organ of society stood above society of free people of the *Kulakara* order, having possessed

[15] *Acaranga Niryukti*, p. 7.
[16] *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 167.
[17] *Yajnavalkya Smrti*, 1, 13. 367.
[18] *Jambudvipa Pannatti*, 2.29 ; *Thananga*, 7. 557.
[19] See the Second Section.
[20] *The Origin of the Family, Private property and the State*, p. 168.

of the public power and of the right to levy taxes, thus they were becoming alien to the society without having any respect from the people. The *Kulakaras* commanded the unstrained and undisputed respect of the people, whereas the future kings of civilization did not. They represented something outside the society and above it, while the *Kulakaras* stood in the midst of the society.

It was the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class which became politically dominant class (i.e. the *Ksatriya-Vaiśya*-class) through the medium of the state and in this way acquired new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class, the *Sūdras*, who had no place in the society and became the tail of the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Kśatriyas* and the *Vaiśyas*—the three exploiting classes. Therefore, the state did not exist from all eternity, but it came into existence at a certain stage of civilization from the need to hold class antagonisms in check and in the midst of the conflict of the classes at the same time under the leadership of Rsabhadeva, the first tribal king in ancient India, according to the Jaina tradition.

Jaina Seminar at Calcutta—A Report

K. M. LODHA

Under the auspices of the Eastern Zone Committee of Bhagawan Mahavira 2500th Nirvana Mahotsav Samiti, a Seminar on Jainism was held on Sunday, the 15th December, 1973 in Calcutta.

Professor Mrityunjaya Banerjee, Minister of Education, Government of West Bengal, presided over the First Session and Sahu Shri Shanti Prasad Jain, Working President of the National Committee, welcomed the President and the participants. Shri Jain laid stress on the importance of the Nirvana Celebrations falling next year and pleaded for practical approach to them He felt that much can be done on the occasion to preach and practise the lessons and teachings of Bhagawan Mahavira in the present times, when man is steeped deep in violence and hatred. Shri Jain urged upon the scholars to bring out a true and objective history of Jainism in its various aspects, which has enriched and influenced Indian culture and to propagate the great tenets of Bhagawan Mahavira to masses not only in India but to the outside world as well.

In the morning session Dr. D. C. Sarkar, former Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History at the University of Calcutta, read his paper on "Jaina Art". Prof. Sarkar dealt at length on the contribution the Jaina Art has made and said that it is outstanding both from the point of quality and quantity He said that in all spheres of creative art, Jainas were supreme. The Jaina temples are found in Bangla Desh also as in the South, North and West of our country. Its influence on the cultural pattern of our country is very great and deep. Dr. Sarkar unequivocally subscribed to the view that variety with deep insight, richness with supreme quality and ethos combined with unparallelld artistic grace are some of the basic characteristics of the Jaina Art. Dr. Sarkar concluded that time is come, when we must make serious efforts to preserve these finest and noblest specimen of human art couched in divinity.

Professor K. C. Lalwani read his paper on the "Principles of Motion & Rest" as propounded in the *Bhagavatī Sūtra*. Professor Lalwani dealt at length on this uncommon metaphysical principle made out by Bhagawan Mahavira to his disciple, Gautama. Defining Matter, he

said, "Matter is said to be that which undergoes modifications by combinations and dissociations". This is the earliest conception of Matter as 'real' and 'dynamic' on which at a much later period the Atomists, Descartes and Leibnitz have written at length in European philosophy. Force, Prof. Lalwani described, is constant in quantity. There is no substance that does not act. There is no substance that is not the expression of Force What does not act does not exist ; what acts is real. Hence Force is the essential attribute of the body. Hence the Law of Conservation of Motion was replaced by Leibnitz by the Law of Conservation of Force or Energy. According to the learned Professor, another proof that Extension is not an essential attribute of the body is that extension is of composite nature, and anything which is made of parts (*pradeśas* or space-points) cannot be the primary principle. Elaborating his point further Prof. Lalwani said that in a sense "a monad is a universe in miniature, a microcosm". It is a "living mirror of the Universe, a concentrated world, a world for itself. But each monad represents the Universe in its own way, from its unique point of view, with its characteristic degree of clearness. The higher the monad, the more clearly and distinctly it perceives, expresses or represents the world." Prof. Lalwani compared Leibnitz's theory of monad with that of Bhagawan Mahavira and maintained that Mahavira's construction from this aspect is unparallelled in human thought and history. He asserted that "the idea of Motion and Rest is an original contribution by the Jainas. Some have compared these with *Rajah* and *Tamah* in the Sankhya view, but the comparison is wrong. The Jainas have considered *Dharma* and *Adharma* to be responsible for the systematic character of the Universe. Without these, there would be only chaos in the cosmos."

Professor S. K. Saraswati, UGC Professor, Calcutta University read his learned paper on "Jaina Motif in Indian and Eastern Architecture." Professor Saraswati is well-known art-critric. He dilated upon the '*sarvatobhadrikā*' style of the Jaina Art and emphasised the enormous and valuable contribution it has made to Indian architecture. Professor Saraswati strongly supported the view that a thorough and scholarly study and research should be undertaken to study the Jaina architecture, which is not only historically important but is one of the greatest art styles in the world. Professor Saraswati gave details of the *sarvatobhadrikā* style and said that "a distinctive Jaina iconographic motif must have been responsible for inspiring it. A four-faced image, usually known as *caturmukha* (*caumukha*), has been a very popular Jaina iconographic theme from fairly early times." Prof. Saraswati went on to maintain : "Indian literature on art frequently

refers to a type of temple called '*sarvatobhadra*'. There are variations in the descriptions of the type in different texts. All the texts, however, are agreed that the fundamental design of a *sarvatobhadra* temple is that of a square shrine with four entrances in the four cardinal directions. Four entrances in the *sarvatobhadra* temple admirably suits the needs to four-faced Jaina image, *pratimā sarvatobhadrikā*, and it is not without significance that the term *sarvatobhadra* has been used as a qualifying designation in each case. The iconographic theme and the architectural design seem to go together, one being complementary to the other " Prof. Saraswati proved that the number of Jaina *sarvatobhadrikā* images of the early centuries of the Christian era is not small. From Eastern India have been discovered also a fairly large number of such images of the early mediaeval epoch. Elaborating this point further, he said, "It will be useful to mention in this context a few early temples of Burma consecrated for Buddhist usage. They repeat not only the iconographic motif of *sarvatobhadrikā* images but also the architectural design of *sarvatobhadra* temples in a clear and explicit manner. In such shrines the iconographic motif in each case occupies the position of the alter. The earliest of these temples seems to have been the Lemeythna at Hmawza (Thayetkhettaya—old Sriksetra). The exact date of this structure is not known." Prof. Saraswati continued, "in the Nat Hlaung Kyaung temple at Pagan in Burma, consecrated to the worship of Visnu, the Jaina motif is seen to have been followed, and in this context it may be useful to enquire whether the scheme finds expression in any Brahmanical temple in India or elsewhere." His conclusion was equally important for in his opinion Jaina motif in architecture as is apparent from the above survey, "is seen to have extended its impact beyond sectarian confines and to have interesting reverberations among the votaries of other faiths, namely Buddhism and Brahmanism, and in territories outside the country. This survey, more or less in outline, illustrates the need for a fuller investigation in this regard."

Dr. Govinda Gopal Mukhopadhyay, Professor & Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Burdwan University and a well-known and outstanding scholar on Indology read his paper on "Jaina Conception of Self". In the words of Dr. Mukhopadhyay, "to the Jainas there is a scale of consciousness at the top of which is *Paramātman* or *Sarvajña*, the Omniscient Being, who is like an ideal which man should try to attain or aim at." But the *Paramātman* is not God, who creates, preserves and destroys the world. The Jaina view denies God and extols man, than whom there is no higher power to be worshipped or adored. No other system of philosophy does uphold the dignity of man in such

a manner as we find in the Jaina system. This view seems to be a vindication of that famous utterance in the *Bhagavad Gītā* :

uddhared ātmanātmānam nātmānamavasādayet
ātmaiva hyātmano bandhurātmaiva ripurātmanah

The Jaina view of Self being as big as the body it inhabits naturally leads one to conclude that the Jainas take the Self in the sense of the Soul. As Dr. Jacobi suggested, the Jainas arrived at their concept of Soul, not through the search after the Self, but through the perception of *life*. For the most general Jaina term for Soul is *Jīva* (life) which is identical with Self (*āyā, ātman*). Dr. Mukhopadhyay was forthright and meaningful when he clearly maintained that if we take the root meaning of the word *ātman* which is derived from the verb '*at*' with the suffix '*manin*', then everyone will have to own that the Jaina view is the truest of all which conforms to the original sense of the word. The root '*at*' implies constant movement (*sātatya gamana*) and the Jaina theory of the infinite progression of the Self brings out this basic characteristic of the *ātman* and that is why we affirmed at the outset that the Jainas are *ātmavādins* in the truest sense of the term. Dr Mukhopadhyay was of opinion that a philosophical analysis and approach in the *Upaniṣads* was very very close to Jainism—the most ancient religious faith in India. Dr. Mukhopadhyay strongly felt that the concept of *Ātmā* as propounded in Jainism is one of the best and the most cogent and logical approaches to it, which enormously impressed and influenced the succeeding philosophies and religions. Dr. Mukhopadhyay stressed that it would be wrong and fallacious to regard these two approaches as wholly contradictory. In many respects, one complements the other, thus clearly signifying their commonness in many points.

Shri K. K. Jain, Convenor of the Seminar Sub-Committee, proposed a vote of thanks and expressed gratitude for the kind co-operation and participation by the guests and scholars. The House then adjourned for the afternoon session.

The afternoon session, was presided over by Dr. S. N. Sen, Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University. Shri Bijoy Singh Nahar, Chairman, Bihar State Committee of Bhagawan Mahavira 2500th Nirvana Mahotsav, accorded a warm welcome to all the participants and outlined the importance of the ensuing Celebrations. He said that the present Seminar is a prelude to these celebrations and is meant to give not only a good start but a valuable impetus also.

The famous Hindi poet Dr. Ramdhari Singh "Dinkar", who was present in this session, said that the historical link of Jaina Tirthankaras is the oldest in human history and if one could obtain a full and authentic account of them, it would clear very much the mist enshrouding them and render a most valuable contribution to the annals of human history by opening new vistas and dimensions.

Dr. S. N. Sen in his presidential address said that the canons of Bhagawan Mahavira should be fully followed and practised to make our democracy a great success. In his opinion, democracy can only flourish successfully and substantially by promoting a non-violent society. Mahavira, in his opinion, foresaw the modern principles of socialism in his great principle of Non-possession. Dr. Sen said that the ethical concept of Jainism is very important and practicable. It has the highest value and social pattern Dr. Sen felt that such Seers as Mahavira and Buddha are the beacon light for all ages, all men and all nations as they not only give faith and conviction to man but also enable him to obtain the *Summum Bonum* of all our existence.

Prof. Vivekananda Mukherjee, Reader in the Cuttack University, Orissa, read his paper on "Jainism and Upanisads". He said that we must propagate the humanitarian outlook of Jainism amongst non-Jainas and the world at large should know more and more of the fundamentals of this religion and philosophy. In his opinion, Jainism is a versatile religion having a most practical and humanly beneficial philosophy to be practised. Jainism disciplines life in its full sense and if we follow the principles of Jainism, much of the present evils would not be there. He underlined the common approach and affinity between Jainism and the *Upaniṣads*. Citing profusely and abundantly from scriptures, Prof. Mukherjee said that the thought and content of the *Upaniṣads* run parallel to those of Jainism. Both might have followed different paths but arrived at a common end, viz., complete Bliss. Prof. Mukherjee analysed the *Samyak Jñāna*, *Samyak Darśana* and *Samyak Cāritra* and said that these are also the ultimate objectives of the *Upaniṣads*. In his opinion, Jainism, the oldest religion in human history, should be fully 're-discovered' now so as to establish a great leeway between the modern and the ancient times.

In his scholarly dissertation, Dr. S. P. Banerjee, Reader in the Department of Philosophy, Calcutta University, read his paper on the "Theory of Moksa in Jainism". Introducing his subject he said that 'every thing existent' must be either a *jiva* or an *ajīva* or a resultant of the two. The concept of *mokṣa* is however relevant only in the

JAINA SEMINAR

Morning Session

(L to R) D. C Sarkar, S K Saraswati, G. G. Mukherjee, Mrityunjay Banerjee, Sahu S P Jain, K. M Lodha, K C Lalwani

Evening Session

(L to R) Adhir Chakravarti, S. P. Banerjee, Vivekananda Mukherjee, A. K. Bhattacharyya, S. N. Sen, B. S. Nahar

context of *jīva*. *Jīva* has been characterized by *upoyoga*, *amūrtatva* (formlessness), *kartṛtva* (agency), *svadeha-parimāṇatva* (extension same as its own body), *bhoga* (enjoyment of the fruits of *karma*), existence in *samsāra* (life in the world) *siddhatva* (pefection) and *ūrddhagatitva* (upward motion). These characteristics of *jīva* sharply points out the distinctiveness of the Jaina view. Prof. Banerjee went on to say that it is certain that the *jīva* has consciousness whatever else it may have or not. *Niścaya Naya* emphasises consciousness as essential for *jīva* while *Vyavahāra Naya* maintains that the *jīva* is possessed of four primes, viz., *indriya* (senses), *bala* (force), *āyu* (life) and *āṇā-prāṇa* (respiration). *Vyavahāra Naya*, however, does not contradict the existence of consciousness ; it is essential through *upoyoga*. The *jīva* has been characterized both as formless and as of the same extension as its body. This appears paradoxical but the paradox may be solved if one considers *jīva* both from the *baddha* and the *mukta* points of view. The *baddha jīva* must have a body but the *mukta jīva* is formless though it has *madhyama-parimāṇa*. The Jaina theory of *mokṣa* strongly suggests the possibility of continuance of individuality after liberation. This may throw new light on the highly interesting problem of immortality. If the theory of personal identity is construed in a fashion in which bodily criterion can be dispensed with, same form of *individual existence* may very well appear plausible in Jainism. Jaina criticism of *Nyāya* concept of *mokṣa* on this particular point is illuminating. Jainism tries to avoid the paradox of multiplicity without distinction on the one hand and total non-dualism which is the logical completion of the other. Prof. Banerjee dealt at length on his subject and made a remarkable survey of the concept of *Mokṣa* in Jainism.

Dr. Adhir Chakravarti, Professor and Head of the Department of History, Jhargram College, read his paper "Some Aspects of Socio-economic Life from the Jaina Canonical Literature". He said that both Mahavira and Buddha hailed from more or less the same region of the country, viz., North-Eastern India and were close contemporaries. This fact has given rise to a tendency amongst scholars to gloss over the facts gleaned from the early Jaina texts. After stating the Buddhist point on any aspect of society and economy, one simply says that the same may be said from the Jaina texts as well. It is, however, conveniently forgotton that the geographical horizon of early Jainism was much wider. It comprised the Ladha country with its sub-divisions, Sumhabhumi (Burdwan and Birbhum districts), Vajjabhumi (possibly Midnapore district), Tamalitti (Tamralipti, modern Tamluk) and Vanga (South-East Bengal), and Sauviradesa (Sovira of the Buddhist texts, Lower Indus Valley) and Sauripura, the birth-place of Aristanemi

in Gujarat in the West. According to tradition, Rsabha, the first of the Tirthankaras, visited, among other countries, Konkan, and Southern Karnataka. This is why the social and economic condition of India as reflected in the early Jaina texts is likely to be more varied. Hence a study of the socio-economic data contained in these will not be mere repetitions of what is known from the Buddhist sources However, such a study suffers from two inherent limitations. In the first place, the Jaina canonical literature primarily refers to the Svetamvara scriptures since the position of the texts of the Digamvara sect still remains to be determined. This literature was composed and compiled in different parts of the country at different times and by different persons. Hence without a rigid stratification according to chronology and region of composition by means of comparative and critical method, there will always be the possibility of projecting a condition prevalent at a later date as valid for an earlier epoch. It is indeed not unlikely that some institution prevalent in Western India in the fifth century A.D. may be interpreted as true of Magadha in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. In the second place, there is no systematic discussion in these texts of social and economic organisation or condition of India What information regarding these can be had is from casual references many of which are unique of their kind with the result that our knowledge of the socio-economic life from these texts will necessarily be incomplete and any deduction from these will be, to say the least, hypothetical.

As for social organisation, the institution of caste is nowhere denied in the Jaina texts. On the other hand, the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* clearly mentions it as the very first of the eight objects of pride. The *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* equally enjoins that a real monk should not take pride in caste distinction. However, the order of precedence in the social hierarchy of the Jainas did not correspond with that of the castes. Such is at least the picture we get from the *Praśna-Vyākaraṇa* which mentions the transgressors of the vow of *brahmacarya* in the following order : kings, overlords, chaplains, high officers of the state. The same text has a more detailed enumeration with regard to the violation of the fifth vow of *aparigraha* : emperors, Vasudevas, Mandalikas, chieftains, Talavaras, commanders-in-chief, millionaires, bankers, Rastrikas, Purohitas and the like. In neither case the usual caste names are to be found It is likely that people mentioned in these two lists were the wielders of power whereas the caste distinction was indicative of prestige only. This might have been the case in the early centuries of the Christian era when viewed from the use of terms of Talavaras, Mandalikas, Rastrikas, etc., the *Praśna-Vyākaraṇa* was compiled. Dr. Chakravarti maintained that "the Sudras as a caste existed only in theory". Even then like the term

Brahmana it came to signify a mode of conduct or a state of attitude. In the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* it is stated that the possessor of good qualities is Brahmana and the reverse, a Sudra. The same text contrasts "the Brahmanas and the Kstriyas with the Candalas". It will, thus, appear that in the early Jaina texts, there is a tendency to use the terms Sudra and Candala as synonymous.

Dr. A. K. Bhattacharyya, Director, Indian Museum, gave his discourse supported with slides. He made a brief survey of the "Jaina Iconography" and stated that the relaxed torso from the Indus Valley Civilization pertains to any of the Jaina Tirthankara figures in their *Kāyotsarga* pose. The Gupta period images of Tirthankara figures show a variety of arrangements of the figures and symbols on them. Sometimes, the Central *dharma cakra* is flanked by the particular symbols or emblems attached to the particular Tirthankaras ; sometimes, again the symbol occupies the central position flanked often by lions signifying the *simhāsana* or the lion-throne. One more feature in Jaina iconography is its depiction of the patrons of the Tirthankaras, and of scenes from the life of the Pontiffs. Dr. Bhattacharya gave varied description of the Jaina images and explained their artistic and symbolic implications. It was, though short, a very vivid and panoramic reproduction of our iconography and its exquisitness.

Shri K. K. Jain again thanked the participants and the audience.

The Seminar was a novel one and the first of its kind which, in the words of a reputed journalist, "displayed a high sense of academic worth and distinction". It was perhaps the first in which top-ranking scholars participated and contributed their valuable papers.

Sahu Shri Shanti Prasad Jain welcomed the proposal to publish these papers and assured of his whole hearted co-operation in this regard.

BOOK REVIEW

1. OUTLINES OF JAINISM by S. Gopalan : Wiley Eastern Private Ltd., New Delhi, 1973 : Pages vii+205 : Price Rs. 12.00

2. MAHATIRTH PAVAPURI (in Hindi) by B. L. Nahata with a foreword by Bijoy Singh Nahar : Sri Jain Svetambar Seva Samiti, Calcutta, 1973 : Pages 80 : Price .50 Paise.

1. Arising out of course-work at the Centre of Advanced Study in Philosophy in the University of Madras, the first book under review is a delightful study on one of the oldest religions of India Though meant primarily for the use of advanced students of Philosophy, the book will be found useful even by the general readers. The author's assertion that "Jainism can be best understood in the light of Indian tradition as a whole", and that "the richness of Indian culture could be appreciated better by delving deep into the various aspects of the Jaina philosophy" is aptly justified in his competent presentation of the subject.

There is justification for his apologia that "the comprehensive vision and the depth of understanding that are characteristic of the Jaina philosophers do not justify spanning the tradition within a meagre 200 pages". But at the same time the fact remains that people have neither time nor patience for encyclopaedic works. If we accept the maxim that something is better than nothing, then this little book is expected to serve a useful purpose and create a place for itself.

There are not many good books on Jainism as a whole in the English language that are based on both the Svetambara and the Digambara traditions. Clearly, the author has drawn from both. He has considered Jaina metaphysics, epistemology, psychology and ethics in the light of the source materials, indicating the sources in footnotes. For the more advanced, there is bibliography in the end.

The inclusion of Acarya Tulsi's *aṇuvrata* movement as a final chapter in the book shows that the author has a sympathetic understanding of the potentiality of Jainism in contemporary life. In the Jaina tradition, *aṇuvrata* is, or at least should be, the life's programme for a lay follower, as *mahāvrata* is a must for the monk. Acarya Tulsi has been the first to emphasize that *aṇuvrata* is a non-sectarian ideology that can

enrich the life of anyone, no matter whether he is a follower of the Jaina path, or of any other. With his message of *aṇuvrata*, the Acarya walked through the length and breadth of the country and has given an alternative that may still make life worth-living. As the author has written in conclusion, "... the significance of the *aṇuvrata* movement as a cure for the evils of the present day lies ... in its approach to the whole problem of peace and unity by suggesting that the immense potentialities that each individual has for promoting social unity can be actualised by developing inner harmony and regulated spiritual evolution."

2. Arising out of an unfortunate controversy as to the exact place of liberation (*nirvāṇa*) of Bhagavan Mahavira, B. L. Nahata's booklet is intended to refute the claim of a village named Sathiano in Deoria as being the place where Bhagavan Mahavira passed away[1] and to reiterate that Majjhima Pava of the Jaina scriptures is the same as the present Pava near Nalanda in Bihar Sarif. As it should appear, the claim made by the author is strictly in conformity with the Jaina tradition which not even the self-appointed supporters of Sathiano can deny. In that way, its publication is timely and should help to remove the wrong impression that is being created by some interested persons.

—K. C. Lalwani

Note : The point at issue in this controversy as to Pava is whether Bhagavan Mahavira passed away at the Pava of the Jaina tradition which is near Nalanda in Magadha or the Pava of the Buddhist tradition which was not far from Kusinara. The point was initially raised by the Western Orientalists who for a fairly long time held that Jainism was a branch of Buddhism and who pressed the point that Mahavira must have passed away at the Buddhist Pava which was near Kusinara The supporting logic was two-fold, viz., that had it been the Jaina Pava, then the news of Mahavira's death would not have reached the Buddha so soon[2], and that the Mallas who are stated to have been present when

[1] See Saraogi, Kanhaiyalal, *Pava-Samiksa* with a foreward by Dr. Jogendra Mishra, Head of the Dept. of History, Patna, University, and a Preface by Muni Nagraj, Muni Mahendra Kumar 'Pratham' and Muni Mahendra Kumar 'Dvitiya' of the Terapanthi Sect.

[2] The story of Mahavira's death which reached the Buddha so soon might have originated in this way. Mahavira was staying at one time at Sravasti, the principal region of the Buddha's activities, when Gosalaka, his former disciple and now the leader of the Ajivakas, came to him and after some altercation, he applied *tejolesya* on him. Due to it, Mahavira had an attack of severe dysentery. It seems that interested persons spread the rumour that Mahavira had died and that there was a quarrel in the Sangha after his death and this might have reached the Buddha so soon. But Mahavira lived 16 years more after the incident.

Mahavira passed away could not have come over to the enemy country that Magadha was. Both the points clash headlong with the Jaina tradition which is now upheld by many European scholars as correct. Even Jacobi has written that there is nothing to question the authenticity of the Jaina tradition. But unfortunately the claim of the Buddhist Pava as the place where Mahavira passed away is now being pressed afresh by a section of the Jaina community on the same grounds as aforesaid. It is, therefore, necessary to dissect the point at issue to meet the renewed challenge against the Jaina tradition whose correctness is upheld not only by thousands of devoted hearts in the Jaina community but is strictly in conformity with the words of the Agamic texts.

According to the *Kalpa Sūtra*, Bhagavan Mahavira entered into *nirvāṇa* at *pāvāe majjhimāye* Anyone having a knowledge of the geography of the region at that time should recollect that there were three Pavas of which one, the Buddhist Pava was in the north, near Kusinara, the second Majjhima Pava of the Jainas was in the middle in Magadha, the principal region of Mahavira's activities, and the third, the capital of the Mallas of the Bhanga country was somewhere near the Parsvanath Hill (Sammet Sikhar). Pava of the Jaina tradition geographically stood in the middle between the other two. Sentimentally, too, this place was to Mahavira as Sarnath was to the Buddha It was at this middle Pava that Mahavira took his first disciples, and hence it was natural for him to select the same place for his final moments where one day he started as a Tirthankara.

Some of the recent enthusiasts of the controversy, notably Mr. K. L. Saraogi is of opinion that the word *majjhimāye* stands for Madhyadesa and in support of this he cites an incomplete text from *Bṛhat Kalpa-Sūtra* confusing it to be from Bhadrabahu's *Kalpa Sūtra*, where, according to him the boundary of Madhyadesa has been given : *kappai nigganthāṇa vā nigganthīṇa vā puratthimeṇaṁ jāva aṅga-magahāo ettae dakkhiṇeṇaṁ jāva kosambīo pañcātthimeṇam jāva thūṇā visayāo uttareṇam jāva kuṇālā visayāo ettae etāvatāva kappai.* But truly speaking this is not the boundary of Madhyadesa but the area where a wandering monk could go, because that was the limit of the Aryan zone : *etāva tāva ārie khette ṇo se kappai etto bāhiṁ teṇa paraṁ jattha nāṇa daṁsaṇa carit'āiṁ ussappaṁti tti bemi.* So *majjhimā* does not stand for Madhyadesa and *majjhimāye pāvāe* does not signify Pava which was to the north of the Ganga.

Other evidences cited by Mr. Saraogi are flimsy and may simply be overlooked. For instance, he cites that about 10 years back a college

named Pavanagar Mahavir Jain Inter College has been founded at the Buddhist Pava. The founding of a college at a certain place is no historical evidence nor can it wash away the epigraphic and literary evidences that have come down to us over centuries.

That the Buddhist texts were motivated in the villification of Mahavira is pretty certain. Many such passages can be cited where effort has been made to belittle Mahavira who was a part of a long tradition. Thus in the *Sāmagāma Sutta, Aṭṭhakathā of Majjhima Nikāya*, it has been stated that before his death, Mahavira was at Nalanda. There, it is stated, 10 *gāthās* were recited in praise of the Buddha in his presence whereon he vomitted blood and was taken ill. In that condition he was taken to Pava where he died. Even in the midst of colossal distortion the grain of truth in the Buddhist account is that he died at Pava near Nalanda which is now disputed by some interested people. In doing so, they have not only done injustice to Mahavira but also to the Buddhist tradition. Surely a man who had been taken ill could be carried only to a distance of a few miles rather than to a distance of about 250 miles, which was the approximate space gap between Nalanda and the Buddhist Pava. It does not make any sense either. According to the Jaina tradition, Mahavira died in excellent health and while he was in the midst of a long sermon.

Taking cue from the arguments advanced by the Western Orientalists and Mr. Saraogi, Muni Sri Nagraj of the Terapanthi Sect has become an ardent supporter of the Buddhist Pava as the place of *nirvāṇa* of Mahavira and asks if Mahavira had died in Pava of the Jaina tradition, how could there have been a reigning monarch named Hastipala when the whole territory was a part of Magadha. It is stated in the Jaina tradition that Mahavira died in the Writers' Building of king Hastipala. Further, he contends that Ajatasatru (Kunika) who was the reigning monarch of Magadha at that time was no friend of Vaisali Republic and that therefore it was not possible for the Mallakis and the Lichhavis to come either to attend the sermon of Mahavira or to be by his side when he passed away. These arguments are too weak to falsify the Jaina tradition. For, even under Magadha, there could have been a vassal king Hastipala at Pava where Mahavira must have died. But a greater certainty is that the Writers' Building belonged at some past date to a king of that name but that at the time Mahavira and his monks occupied the building for their monsoon sojorn, it was a discarded thing. At least that is the impression one gets from the *Tīkā*. Had the Writers' Building been in regular use, it could not have been a suitable place for such a large body of monks to reside there for four months

when clerks and other officers of the state would be humming all over the building minding their own business. The presence of the Mallakis and the Licchavis at Mahavira's sermon should not put one to guess. It is a fact of history, including contemporary history, that pilgrims are always allowed entry into the enemy country, unless the two countries are in a state of warfare. It is on record in the Jaina literature that Canda Pradyot of Avanti who came to beseize Kausambi attended the sermon of Mahavira, in which Queen Mrigavati of Kausambi was also present.

An alternative suggestion has been that if Mahavira did not die at the Buddhist Pava, he may have died at the third Pava in the south which was the land of the Mallas of the Bhanga country which is near the Parsvanath Hill (Sammet Sikhar) in South Bihar. The supporting, though again distorted, logic of this group has been that at the fag end of his life, Mahavira must have been roaming in the vicinity of the sacred hill where so many Tirthankaras had entered into their liberation in the past. When the Jaina tradition about the place of Mahavira's liberation comes so easy, one wonders what pleasure do these people derive by deviating from it simply for the sake of deviation.

Finally, to attend a trivial point made by Muni Sri Mahendra Kumar 'Pratham', also of the Terapanthi Sect, the Muni has expressed a doubt on the ground that if the previous monsoon was spent by Mahavira at Rajagrha, how could the next one be at Pava which was so very near? Or, to put it differently, according to Muni Sri, did Mahavira cover the distance of a few miles in a whole year ? We will only ask Muni Sri to look to what the monks do at present. The monks spend a monsoon, say, at Calcutta and then they move out. They are wandering in the districts and during the next monsoon, they come back again to Calcutta. Can we say from this that the monks made no travelling between the two monsoons ? The fact in Mahavira's life is that most of his monsoons were spent within a small region and therefore if he had spent one monsoon at Rajagrha and another at Pava, there is nothing to be struck back by it. In fact, he spent two consecutive monsoons at Rajagrha, Vaisali and Mithila more than once and at one time monsoon sojourn at Rajagrha was followed by another at Nalanda. The truth is that there is no day-to-day dairy available about Mahavira's wanderings. All that we know is that he spent one monsoon at Rajagrha and another at Pava which is perfectly logical and consistent with facts, and we must have the good sense to accept it.

—*Editor.*

Our Contributors

MUNI MAHENDRA KUMAR 'PRATHAM', a learned monk of the Terapanthi Sect.

B. A. SALETORE, Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture and Head of the Department of History, University of Karnatak, Dharwar.

J. C. SIKDAR, Senior Research Officer, L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad

K. M LODHA, Head of the Department of Hindi, Calcutta University, Calcutta.

Registered with the Registrar
of Newspapers for India
under No. R. N. 12121/66.

Winter 1974